DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 281 547 IR 051 890

AUTHOR Allen, Alice

TITLE Local Cataloging Policies in ARL Libraries. SPEC Kit 110.

INSTITUTION Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C. Office of Management Studies.

PUB DATE Jan 85
NOTE 131p.; Best copy available.
AVAILABLE FROM Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20036 ($20.00 prepaid).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - General (020) -- Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; *Cataloging; *Editing; Higher Education; *Library Standards; Occupational Information; Policy; Position Papers; Questionnaires; *Research Libraries; Subject Index Terms
IDENTIFIERS Authority Control (Information); Retrospective Conversion (Library Catalogs)

ABSTRACT

Compiled from information and documents gathered during telephone and in-person interviews with Association of Research Library (ARL) member libraries, this publication examines cataloging policies designed to supplement national and network standards and cover situations that are not addressed at the national level. A concise summary discusses standards for copy editing, minimal-level cataloging (MLC) to reduce backlogs and provide access to material, local policies for authority work, and policies for retrospective conversion. Documents provided in the kit include: (1) standards for copy editing from the University of Arizona, Iowa State University, and Northwestern University; (2) standards for minimum cataloging from Northwestern University and a report on minimal-level cataloging from the University of Michigan; (3) a memorandum on subject heading policy from Northwestern University; and (4) a statement on professional responsibilities of the cataloging department from Duke University. An ARL Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) evaluation form is also included. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

ED281547

Local Cataloging Policies

Kit 110

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Maxine Sitts

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

spec flyer #110, January 1985 OMS
Systems and Procedures Exchange Center

ISSN 1060 3574

LOCAL CATALOGING POLICIES IN ARL LIBRARIES

When asked about cataloging standards, many catalog librarians in Association of Research Libraries institutions reply that they adhere conscientiously to national and network standards, follow AARC2 as interpreted by the Library of Congress, consult all appropriate format documents as issued by their networks, and so on. Although conforming to national standards is essential for any library in a shared cataloging environment, there are also a number of issues addressed by local cataloging practices and policies. This flyer and kit provides information and documents gathered during telephone and in-person interviews with a number of ARL members.

National and network cataloging standards have to do specifically with the creation of original records, and have as their objective the provision of high quality cataloging data that can be shared. Local cataloging policies supplement national and network standards and cover situations that are not addressed on a national level. They are concerned with the creation and maintenance of catalogs in local institutions, and often answer questions about how new cataloging will fit into existing catalogs, and about how conflicts and problems in those catalogs can be identified and resolved. Local policies also can help make the best of a library's limited resources. They can deal with setting priorities and eliminating backlogs. Another characteristic of local policies is that they may be related to, or have an impact on, evaluation of individual performance. Libraries often have formal or informal quantitative expectations for catalogers, as well as procedures for evaluating the quality of the work done.

COPY EDITING. Networks do not typically establish standards for the editing of existing catalog records by individual libraries. Changes in catalog copy made at the local level either can't be seen by searchers at the network level (as in OCLC) or reside in the database along with the source record and other local variations (as in RLIN). However, because of the large percentage of local cataloging which is in fact found in the bibliographic utility's database, standards for editing that copy have a potentially large impact on the quality of a local catalog. In order to make the cataloging process expeditious and cost effective, libraries must employ standards, whether written or unwritten, for processing copy. Topics frequently addressed in copy editing standards include the level to which content designation is revised or supplied when lacking; acceptance of data without checking; and addition of local information. Once a record is in a local catalog or database, it makes no difference to the user whether that record was original cataloging or copy; the important considerations are the quality of the data, how it relates to other records already in the catalog, and whether it meets local information needs.

MINIMAL LEVEL CATALOGING. Minimal level cataloging (MLC) is seen as a way to reduce backlogs and provide access to materials which otherwise would have none. Consideration of MLC is an implicit acknowledgement that standards for full level records are not practical for all materials, nor can libraries afford to maintain those standards for all materials. While national and network standards for MLC are as yet not well established, most local policies identify materials for which minimal level cataloging will be employed, its place in the workflow, and the staff who will create it.

The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) is operated by the Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Telephone (202) 232-8656.

AUTHORITY WORK. Local policies address questions of whether authority work is done at the time of cataloging or, for libraries that are maintaining card catalogs, when cards are filed. They also help identify who is responsible for identifying conflicts in the catalogs, who corrects them, or which ones can be left uncorrected without serious detriment to the quality of the catalog. Other documents address the library's policy on the provision of cross references.

RETROSPECTIVE CONVERSION. Policies regarding retrospective conversion are usually appropriate for local decisions, unless the library is adding new records to the database of a bibliographic utility, or has joined with others in developing a mutually-agreed upon set of standards, e.g., for maintaining a union catalog. Because local environments differ, so do requirements for retrospective conversion. Typically, local policies deal with completeness and consistency of the record, amount of checking (if any) of access points, and the degree of updating or revision of cataloging that should occur.

ISSUES AND TRENDS. A sensitive issue related to local cataloging policies is that of quantitative expectations for individual catalogers. Often such expectations are informal or unwritten. They tend to be controversial partly because they seem more appropriate for catalog librarians than for other professionals, and partly because they vary regarding the degree to which they consider the other professional responsibilities of the librarians involved. However, statistics on cataloging throughput are valuable management tools that have to be kept. Books and other materials are visible realities and must be processed. Administrators are legitimately concerned about the expense of cataloging. This concern is often not completely obviated by a library's participation in a bibliographic utility; in fact, it is often intensified by such participation because of the expectations raised by the availability of shared cataloging. Administrators can see resistance to quantitative cataloging performance standards for librarians as a reluctance to examine policies and procedures for the most efficient ways to accomplish tasks. Although the topic seems destined to remain controversial, the sharing of information among libraries is one method of making it less so.

A trend with implications over the next few years is the development of policies that take into account the existence of online catalog systems. Many libraries, although they have been creating machine readable cataloging records for a number of years, have not yet had the opportunity to use those records in an online environment. When they do, the effects of previous policy decisions may become apparent in new ways, and revisions may be needed. Local policies on level of copy editing, inclusion of fixed field data, minimal level records, and extent of subject access will be subject to review as online catalogs are implemented and patrons make their needs known. Continued research into the use of online catalogs is essential to informed decision-making about cataloging quality. Then too, the capabilities of online systems will make possible creative and innovative approaches to procedures, workflow, and staffing patterns, all of which affect the quality of the catalog record as well.

The Kit on Local Cataloging Policies in ARL Libraries (#110, January 1985, 118 pages) contains 3 library policies on copy editing, 2 on minimal level cataloging, 1 on subject headings, and 1 on professional responsibilities. SPEC Kits are available mainly by subscription from: SPEC Center, Office of Management Studies, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Individual kits are available for $20.00 prepaid. Outside the U.S. and Canada, add $5.00 per order to the prepayment for parcel post shipping. (ARL library members receive kits for $10.00).

This Flyer/Kit was prepared as part of the
Collaborative Research/Writing Program
by Alice Allen, Head of the Cataloging
Department, University of Oregon.

USES OF SPEC KITS

The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) is a clearinghouse operated by the Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies that provides a central source of timely information and materials on the management and operations of large academic and research libraries. It facilitates the exchange of knowledge and documents through SPEC Kits, which are distributed ten times each year to ARL members and other interested libraries. The Kits include topically-arranged groupings of unedited primary source documents – selected for their value to administrators and decision-makers – that illustrate a wide range of alternative approaches to specfic issues.

Kit documents come from general membership surveys and from selected libraries contacted directly by SPEC, and most Kits are produced within six months of surveys. The documents' value comes from their variety of ideas, methods, and solutions. They are not viewed as finished products, but rather as points of departure for a library's planning efforts and as stimulants to innovative approaches to problem-solving. As such, Kits do not present answers or prescriptions for any one library; instead they illustrate how selected ARL members are planning for or dealing with particular issues. The worth of any one Kit to a particular library will depend upon the specific topic covered and the library's stage of development in that area.

Materials are selected according to the following criteria:

- Presents an approach of potential value to administrators and decision-makers
- Timely, and dealing directly with the topic under consideration
- Probability of application of ideas or thinking to other library situations
- Illustrative of actual practice, rather than theoretical
- Understandable, readable communication

All together, the materials should provide a range of alternative approaches that complement each other, provide variety, and stimulate comparison and contrast.

Libraries can take advantage of the Kit compilations in a number of ways. Administrators can evaluate the assumptions, methods, and results of other libraries' approaches; compare and contrast them; and use the learnings in their own situations. Library staff members can use the kits as professional development and current awareness tools. Committees and task forces can use them to begin a review of current practices. And the Kits can identify other persons or places to contact for further information. Back-up files in the SPEC office also are available for loan to member libraries. In addition, SPEC will conduct on-demand surveys or analyses geared specifically for a single library.

EVALUATION

Kit Title/Number _____

1. Which uses did the library make of this Kit?

2. Please indicate how useful the Kit was for these purposes.

☐ Very Useful ☐ Quite Useful ☐ Somewhat Useful ☐ Not Useful

3. Do you have suggestions for this Kit or for future Kits?

(optional)

NAME _____

LIBRARY _____

PHONE _____

Please return this form to the SPEC Center, OMS/ARL, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington DC 20036.

1/82

ISSN 0160 3582

LOCAL CATALOGING POLICIES
SPEC KIT #110 JANUARY 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

COPY EDITING

090 Cataloging Instructions. University of Arizona. 1

Areas of OCLC Record Requiring Examination/ Change During Editing. Iowa State University. 10

Draft: LC Copy - Acceptance - November 1985 Memo. RLIN Copy Cataloging -- March 1983 Memo. Use of Library of Congress Cataloging Copy -- June 1982 Memo. Copy Cataloging: A Position Report - May 1982. Use of Dewey Numbers -- January 1980 Memo. LC Copy -- Use in Copy Cataloging - April 1979 Memo. Northwestern University. 15

MINIMAL LEVEL CATALOGING

Standards for Level 1 -- June 1982 Memo. Northwestern Universty. 31

Access for Users. Report of the Working Group on Minimal Level Cataloging and Processing Priorities. February 1984. University of Michigan. 34

SUBJECT HEADING POLICY

Catalog Department Memorandum. June 1982. Northwestern University. 59

Statement of Professional Responsibilities for the Cataloging Department. Report of the Committee. November 1979, with March 1984 Preface. Duke University. 64

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

University of Arizona

090 Cataloging

The following parts of an 090 cataloging record should be checked for editing:

Fixed fields:

Make sure the lang, illus, conf pub, ctry, dat type (in case of reprints and photocopies), M/F/B, cont, and dates are done correctly. If the fixed fields were incompletely done on your record, you may have to update other fields in order to correct or add the above fields.

Fields between fixed and call number:

010: Always add, if on your piece. You can add in ǂz if card number on your piece is actually for related piece. (See tagging manual for explanatin of ǂz.)

020: Always add the ISBN for the piece or pieces in hand. If there are multiple ISBNs, determine which is for your piece and add it. If you can't determine which of two ISBNs match your piece, add both. If you have a set ISBN and individual vol. ISBNs, always add the set one and add the individual volume ones as well (within a reasonable number.) If you have a large volume set and no set ISBN, add the ISBNs for the first two volumes.

041: Check and correct or add if necessary in the case of translations.

All other fields between the 020 and the call number can be ignored for the purposes of copy cataloging.

University of Arizona

Call numbers:

090: Be sure to add an assigned 090 call number, when editing online and remember there can be only one 090 field per record. When filing your shelflists, quickly check the cards around your call number to make sure your call number is at least in the right ballpark. If you need to slide your cutter because the cutter has been used, try to maintain alphabetical order, but don't worry if this is not possible. Remember that areas in the shelflist that are double cuttered and all literature areas need a little more checking. If you question a call number, ask Vicki or subject cataloger.

Add dates to all call numbers with the exception, most times, of supplements and indexes. Call numbers for photocopies use the date of the original with "a" added. Call numbers for conferences use the date of the conference rather than the date of publication. (See copy of CSB 19, p 25.)

Each separate line of a call number can be no longer than 8 characters.

070: These numbers will not print on our cards, an 090 needs to assigned. These should be considered as 090 ∅.

099: If you have a long involved call number, you can input it in an 099 field. PZ2001 numbers (though rarely used now) should be input as 099s.

098: Arizona call numbers are added in this field. The only Az call numbers we should be using anymore are E9791 (university docs) and T9791 (state docs).

The following documents for cuttering should assist you with call numbers: examples of LC cuttering of titles beginning with numbers; cutter tables for regions and countries, U.S. states, authors, and for biographees including artists.

University of Arizona

Title page transcription (1xx, 245, 7xx)

Make sure the title page has been transcribed correctly and completely and that all the needed access points are on your record, either as main entry or added entries. This is the most important part of your cataloging, so take care with this. If name entry (either personal or corporate) is being added to a record, be sure to search the online authority file and add this name in its correct AACR2 form. If no online record can be found add the name the way it appears on the piece. If the name you add is based on an authority record, include the online record number on the printout to assist the A team. Also be sure to add all extra title added entries - either variant forms on the piece (cover or spine title, etc.), those mandated in the title added entry policy (245.1) and any earlier or related titles.

Remember to always check all non-filing indicators (245 2nd indicator, 740 1st indicator, etc.) so that initial articles are ignored in filing. This is very important for our online catalog. Also in all name/title added entries (7xx ≠t, 8xx ≠t), the initial article needs to be dropped from the ≠t.

University of Arizona

Uniform titles (130 and 240)

U-titles need to be used for translations, unrevised editions with different titles in the same language and for works that have come out over the years in many different titles and need one u-title to keep them all filing together. This last category is the hardest to define and the most often missed kind of u-title. In this group fit works like the Bible, Beowolf, Mother Goose (which would all require 130 uniform titles) and most of the works of voluminous authors (which would require 240 uniform titles).

Initial articles are always dropped from uniform titles - not ignored in filing but dropped completely.

If you have a translation and you can't find the title in the original language anywhere in the book and it also is not on the EHL, then do not worry about adding the 240. If you have a translation of a Russian book, show the book and printout to Paul Sabovik, so he can check the transliteration of the Russian title.

When you have a book that was previously published in the same language under a different title, set up the first title as the uniform title if the book has not been revised, edited, abriged, etc. If the book tells you it has been revised, etc. or if you can determine that by a great change in pagination or illustration, don't make a u-title but do make a 500 note and make an author/title or title added entry.

There are several policies about the use of uniform titles (130.1, 130.2). Also refer to the voluminous author uniform title list.

242 is a translated title field, we do not use it and it should be deleted from the record.

University of Arizona

Imprint (260)

Make sure your printout matches your book. Differences in publisher and/or year are often the indication of different editions and this sometimes gets missed by Pre-Cat. If you think that your printout and book don't match, return them to Pre-Cat. (See local document on editions vs printings and choosing a matching record.)

If the place of publication is not qualified on the printout, don't bother to qualify. If a U.S. city is prominently named and not on the printout, add it. Accept without change any form of the publisher's name. If the date matches don't worry about adding or deleting the "c" in front of the date.

Description (300)

DO NOT SPEND MUCH TIME ON THIS FIELD. The description should adequately describe your piece, don't worry about preliminary paging and don't remeasure your book unless the #c looks way off. Tables are not considered illustrations, so do not add ill. for tables only. Do add "map/s" to the =b if you book includes one or more maps and this is not indicated in the description.

University of Arizona

Series statement: This is undoubtedly the most difficult part of the record.

4xx: The 4xx field should show the series title exactly as it appears on the piece whether it is traced or not.

490 0b is used for a series that is not traced.

440 is used for a series that is traced exactly the same way as it appears on the piece.

490 1b is used for a series that is traced, but in a form different than that found on the piece. The 490 1b shows the way the series appears on the piece and the 8xx field shows how the series will actually be traced. Use the 490 1b and the 8xx combination any time a series is traced differently and remember that this also includes any difference in numbering or numbering pattern.

8xx: The 8xx is needed if the series title on the piece differs in any way, no matter how small, with the way the series should be traced. Either the 440 or the 8xx fields should exactly match the series heading as it is established on the series authority card. Under AACR2 most series will be traced either in the 440 or the 830 field, there will be some personal author series traced in the 800 field with a #t but there will be almost no corporate author series, so the 810 field will be used quite infrequently.

Sometimes there are statements that look like series but in reality are not, two policies that deal with these are 400.3 and 400.5.

If the series on your piece can only be found in the CIP info on the verso of title page or on the book jacket, search the series in the LC online authority file and in our SAF. If you find the series either place go ahead and use the series in your cataloging and do necessary series authority work. If the series cannot be found, delete it from your record.

12

University of Arizona

Series (Continued)

There are guidelines for deciphering the online series authority record (policy 400.7) and for setting up new series authority cards (policy 400.4) and for updating old series cards for the new cat (policy 440.6). All series going into the new cat have to be established in an AACR2 form, either based on a DLC authority record (DLC/AUTH AACR2), a DLC a level bib record (DLC AACR2), or bk cat (Bk cat. AACR2). Series authority cards based on a DLC authority record do not have to be put on the series truck if you think there is no problem with them. Series authority cards based on DLC a level bib record or on bk cat should be set up as best you can with all x-refs that you think are needed and then put on the series truck for verification by a cataloger. There are pages about series from various LC CSBs that may be useful in helping you set up series and you can always ask Lynn or Vicki for assistance.

University of Arizona

Notes (5xx)

Make sure that there is some kind of note about the presence of bibliograhies and indexes. Don't change the general bibliography note: 500 Includes bibliography and index. for the specific note: 504 Bibliography: p. x.

All translations need an explanatory note.

If you are using title added entries (730 or 740) or author/title added entries (7xx ≠t) for alternate forms of title or for related titles, make sure there is a 500 note to explain the title added entry.

The little purple book Monograph cataloging notes has many examples of all kinds of notes. A copy is at Lynn's desk and also on the catalog reference shelf.

University of Arizona

Subject headings (6xx)

650 b0 Topical subject heading from the Library of Congress Subject Headings books.
600 00, 600 10, 600 20 - Personal names used as subject headings.
610 10, 610 20 - Corporate names used as subject headings.
611 10, 611 20 - Conference names used as subject headings.

In subject headings, the second indicator is very important. A 0 indicates the subject heading is Library of Congress. These will always print on our cards. All other second indicators are not acceptable for our library and they will not print on our cards. Subject headings with second indicators other than 0 need to have the subject headings checked in LCSH and changed to a standard LC subject heading (remember to change the indicator as well). If you have duplicate sets of subject headings, i.e. 650 b0's and 650 b1's, you can leave the record as it is because the 0's with print on our cards and the 1's will not.

690 or 691 are local subject headings used by the library that input the record on OCLC, these too must be checked in LCSH and changed to standard LC subject headings. 69x's will print on our cards, so remember to always change them to the correct LC form. Sometimes a library will use several 650 b0 and then add one or two 690's. If the 650's adequately describe the subject content of the book, you can simply delete the 690's.

Remember that many geographic names can be found in LC's online authority file. If you suspect a geographic subject heading is incorrect, particularly those in indirect form, or if you are adding a geographic name to a record - be sure to check the authority file. Gene Spesard is a good person to consult if you need help with geographic names.

To help you in assigning subject headings, there is the list of free floating subdivisions and the handouts from the LC subject workshop. Also remember that all subject headings need to checked against the short list of major subject heading changes, this is especially important for all older cataloging.

Iowa State University

Areas of OCLC Record Requiring Examination/Change during Editing (Excluding NEW Command)

Variable Fields	DLC/DLC DLC/Member	Member compared with DLC	Member only
010	Do not examine	Same	Same
015	Do not examine	Same	Same
020	Examine, correct	Same	Same
022	Do not examine	Same	Same
025	Do not examine	Same	Same
040	Examine, do not change	Same	Same
041	Examine and correct	Same	Same
043	Do not examine	Same	Same
049	Input as applicable	Same	Same
050	Examine, correct Do not add date on older records	Examine, correct, add	Same
051	Do not examine	Same	Same
055	Do not examine	Same	Same
060	Do not examine	Same	Same
070	Do not examine	Same	Same
080	Do not examine	Same	Same
082	Do not examine	Same	Same
086	Examine for correct 1st indicator and correct (will not produce if indicator not completed). Do not examine government publication number.	Same	Same

10

16

17

Iowa State University

Variable Fields	DLC/DLC	DLC/Member	Member compared with DLC	Member only
090	N.A.		Compare, correct, remove, add as appropriate	Check, correct, add as appropriate
092	Do not examine		Same	Same
096	Do not examine		Same	Same
099	Add if appropriate; do not need to delete other call number fields.		Same	Same
100	Examine for content and correct anything not requiring verification. Investigate variance between record and order card. Examine and correct 1st indicator for indexing. Change 2nd indicator if subject entry needed; check 6xx before changing. Do add subfield codes if they were omitted.		Examine for content and correct anything not requiring verification. Correct member to agree with LC without verifying. Investigate variance between record and order card. Examine and correct 1st indicator for indexing. Change 2nd indicator if subject entry needed, check 6xx before changing. Do add subfield codes if they were omitted.	Verify, examine, and correct
110	Same as 100 except examine and change assignment of ≠b.		Same as 100 except examine and change assignment of ≠b.	Same as 100
111	Same as 100 except examine and change assignment of ≠b - e.		Same as 100 except examine and change assignment of ≠b - e.	
130	Examine for content. Investigate variance between record and order card. Change 2nd indicator if subject entry needed; check 6xx before changing. Ignore assignment of subfield codes except for Bible. Remove initial articles.		Same	Verify, examine and correct

11

Iowa State University

Variable Fields	DLC/DLC DLC/Member	Member compared with DLC	Member only
240	Examine and change 1st indicator to 0. Exceptions: Music - Examine for content and correct anything not requiring verification. Investigate variance between record and order card. Works - Shorten or add.	Same	Verify, examine and correct
241	Do not examine	Same	Same
245	Examine for accuracy and completeness and correct. Examine and correct indicators. Make 740 for title and/or subtitle as appropriate - see "Guidelines for adding 740's".	Same	Same
250	Examine for accuracy and completeness and correct.	Same	Same
260	Examine for accuracy and completeness and correct. Examine 1st indicator.	Same	Same
300	Examine but ignore minor variations. If CIP, complete.	Examine and complete, but ignore minor variations.	Same
350	Do not examine	Same	Same
400	Examine and correct according to local practice. Remove initial articles in ≠t.	Same	Same
410	Examine and correct according to local practice. Examine ≠a - b, t. Remove initial article in ≠t.	Same	Same
411	Examine and correct according to local practice. Examine ≠a - e, t, p, v. Remove initial article in ≠t.	Same	Same

12

Iowa State University

Variable Fields	DLC/DLC	DLC/Member	Member compared with DLC	Member only
440	Examine and correct according to local practice. Examine and correct 2nd indicator. Ignore ≠x.		Same	Same
490	Examine and correct according to local practice. Examine and correct 1st indicator. Ignore ≠x.		Same	Same
500	Examine for accuracy and completeness and change. Change for content, but not wording. Complete and correct C.I.P.		Same	Same
501	Same as 500		Same as 500	Same as 500
502	Same as 500		Same as 500	Same as 500
503	Do not examine		Same	Same
504	Do not examine. Exception: If CIP, examine and complete.		Do not examine	Do not examine.
505	Examine to see if all volumes noted and correct if necessary. Do not examine for accuracy of title transcription. Accept 2 as indicator, if appropriate.		Same	Same
520	Do not examine		Same	Same
590	Add with discretion		Same	Same
600 - 651	Examine for obvious errors in content but not for delimiter assignment and correct. Remove initial articles in ≠t and in field 630. Be certain geographical subject headings are tagged as 651.		Correct member to agree with LC. Remainder same as for DLC.	Examine cautiously. Investigate doubtful headings. Remainder same as for DLC.

13

22

23

Iowa State University

Variable Fields	DLC/DLC	DLC/Member	Member compared with DLC	Member only
690-691	N.A.		Delete, assign LC headings or refer.	Delete or refer
700	Examine for content and correct anything not requiring verification. Investigate variance between record and order card, as applicable. Examine and correct 1st indicator for indexing. Ignore 2nd indicator. Do not be converned about assignment of subfield codes. Remove initial articles in ≠t, as appropriate.		Examine for content and correct anything not requiring verification. Correct member to agree with LC without verifying. Investigate variance between record and order card, as applicable. Examine and correct 1st indicator for indexing. Ignore 2nd indicator. Do not be concerned about assignment of subfield codes. Remove initial articles in ≠t, as appropriate.	Verify, examine, correct
710	Same as 700		Same as 700	Verify, examine, correct
711	Same as 700 except examine and change assignment of ≠a - e, q, t.		Same as 700 except examine and change assignment of ≠a - e, q, t.	Verify, examine, correct
730	Examine for accuracy and completeness and correct for content. Ignore 2nd indicator. Remove initial articles in ≠t. Use for serial titles and entries for linkage purposes.		Same	Same
740	Examine for accuracy and completeness and correct for content. Ignore 2nd indicator. Use for added title entries, including translations.		Same	Same
800-811	Examine and correct according to local practice. Examine and correct 1st indicator. Remove initial articles in ≠t.		Same	Same
840	Examine and correct according to local practice. Examine and correct 2nd indicator.		Same	Same
87x	Do not correct			

Northwestern University

DRAFT

LC COPY--ACCEPTANCE

Catalog Department Memorandum
85-1 (JSH)
November 21, 1984

SUBJECT: Acceptance and examination of LC copy used in monographic copy cataloging

In order to make cataloging of individual items as inexpensive and fast as possible, the Catalog Department accepts and uses Library of Congress cataloging copy and/or practice whenever it can be obtained or ascertained, so long as it does not interfere with processing priorities or the retrievability of any item.

NOTE: Use of RLIN member copy is covered in CDM84-1.

I. Primary and Secondary Fields

For the purposes of copy cataloging, the data elements of a cataloging record are divided into two types:

A. Primary fields:
An error in a primary field could significantly affect retrievability and/or identification of a work. Primary fields include:
- Main Entry
- All Added Entries, inlcuding Titles and Series
- Subject Tracings
- Title
- Edition
- Imprint
- NUL Classification Number

B. Secondary Fields:
All remaining fields are defined as Secondary. Errors in LC copy in these fields do not significantly affect retrievability or identification of a work. Secondary fields include: Fixed Field and Associated Data, Other Title Information, Physical Description, Notes, LC Classification Number.

Examination of LC copy is carried out as follows:

II. In Copy Cataloging Section

A. With Exact MARC Copy:
This is the most straightforward type of cataloging and allows complete implementation of the policy of accepting LC copy. In "worksheet order", data fields are checked as follows:

1. Begin at the Main Entry, ignoring all information above. Examine the Main Entry, Title, Edition (if any), and Imprint closely for content and tagging. Check the Main Entry for consistency with the database (and perform necessary authority work). Do not question choice of Main Entry. To the extent possible, do not read other fields between Title and Imprint.

2. Skip All fields between Imprint and the Added Entries. Errors in content, tagging, typing, etc. in these fields will not be detected by the cataloger. Any such errors detected at some later point are not considered catalogers' mistakes.

3. Examine all Added Entries as closely as the Main entry. Do not question choice of Added Entries.

4. Examine Subject Headings for content within the limits set for copy cataloging (see CDM82-22, CDM82-23). Check for typographical errors and tagging.

5. If alteration of data in a Primary Field renders data in a Fixed Field inacccurate, revise the fixed field data.

6. Use the suggested Dewey number as a guide in creating an NUL Call number (see CDM80-5).

B. With Exact Non-MARC LC Copy (Direct Input):
Examine Primary Fields closely. Supply Fixed Field and Associated Data. If the record has been fully input by Acquisitions Dept., skim Secondary Fields very briefly. If the record has been only partially input, check to see that all Secondary Fields are in the record. Judgement must sometimes be exercised in deciding if some areas need special attention. e.g. If a record is not yet input, it could be decided that a lengthy Contents note is not important enough to justify keying extended text.

C. With Variant (VE) Copy:
Copy is not for the item in hand. Examine all data elements, checking against the piece to determine differences from the cataloging copy. Alter copy as appropriate. Take special care with the Physical Description and Notes. Change the LCN and Standard Book Number as necessary.

III. Copy Cataloging Oustide Copy Cataloging Section

The principle of copy acceptance governs copy cataloging no matter where performed or by whom, but certain types of materials may require special attention to fields not normally scrutinized:

A. Special Collections:
The aspect of a work which causes it to be selected for Special Collections often interferes with full application of general copy acceptance practices. Inspect both the copy and the work being cataloged carefully, and verify all data elements. Fields may need to be added (e.g. special series, notes for authors' autographs, etc.) to satisfy the requirements of Special Collections.

B. Africana:
Generally follow guidelines in II above. Some fields may require special attention from time to time (e.g. the Geographic Area Code may be especially prone to error).

C. Slavica:
Generally follow guidelines in II above, but pay special attention to romanization in Primary Fields.

D. Copy Cataloging in General Monographic Cataloging:
Copy cataloging performed by professional catalogers is generally because of difficulty or for instructional purposes, making it difficult to predict which fields will deserve full attention, and which can be ignored. Professional catalogers should keep in mind the goal of fast, inexpensive, and generally uncomplicated cataloging, and should give no field more attention than it deserves.

SUPERSEDES: CDM79-2

RELATED DOCUMENTS: CDM79-3 Contents notes in copy cataloging; CDM82-22 Subject Heading Policy; CDM82-23 Subject heading policy appendix; CDM84-1 RLIN member copy cataloging; CDM80-5 Use of Dewey numbers; PPM574 Use of LC copy; PPM575 Use of LC Dewey Numbers

ALTERNATE FILING TERMS: Copy Cataloging--Using LC copy

Northwestern University

Issued By: Janet Swan Hill, Head, Catalog Department	• Remove:
	• Insert: P575
Topic: Use of Dewey Numbers	• Chapter: IV
Descriptors: Dewey Numbers; Suggested Dewey Numbers; Special Classification Schemes; Classification--Exceptions to LC Practice.	• Section: B
	• Date: Jan. 8, 1980

Generally, suggested Dewey numbers present on LC cataloging copy are taken as given. Exceptions are listed below.

1. The Dewey number must not contain more than five numerals following the decimal point. Longer numbers are cut off at a logical point (such as at the point of adding form, period, place, or other standard subdivisions). The limitation on the number of characters used is based on machine restraints. Exceptions must be authorized by the Principal Cataloger.
2. Special NUL classification schemes are used for **Goethe, Schiller, Shakespeare, and the classics.**
3. A special NUL classification scheme is used for **Latin American** songs, theater, and literature.
4. **Africana materials** in the social sciences or works about a single country are classified geographically in the 960's rather than by subject. A special NUL-devised classification scheme is used for African government documents.
5. Works of **literary authors and artists** for whom class numbers have already been established in a particular literary form are classified according to NUL precedent.
6. Special classification numbers are assigned to certain categories of **children's literature** in the Curriculum Collection. (See CDM 71-10)
7. Generally, **later editions** of works are classified with the first edition.
8. **Biographies and general critical works** concerning a particular author are classed together. **Bibliographies** of the persons works are classed in previously established numbers in the 016's if possible.
9. All potential exceptions to the general rule or to the exceptions listed above are to be brought to the supervisor or to the Principal Cataloger.

575

Northwestern University

Issued by: Janet Swan Hill, Head, Catalog Department	Remove: p574 Insert: p574
Topic: Use of Library of Congress Cataloging Copy	Chapter: IV Section: B
Descriptors: Copy Cataloging; LC practice	Date: June 25, 1982

POLICY

In order that the per item cataloging cost for materials handled in in the Catalog Department be as low as possible, and that the speed of cataloging be as great as possible, Catalog Department policy is to accept and use Library of Congress (LC) cataloging copy and practice whenever it can be obtained, so long as the acquisition of copy or the acceptance of practice does not interfere with (1) the processing priority of an individual item, (2) the quality or consistency of NUL's catalogs as it affects the retrievability of any item, and (3) so long as the cost of handling materials while continuing to wait for LC copy does not exceed the cost of cataloging without copy.

The practical results of the policy are summarized as follows:

A. Form of entry: The form of any entry element (main, added, series, or subject entry), conforms with that used by the Library of Congress, when that use can be ascertained.

B. Series treatment: A series is traced or not in accordance with LC practice, when that practice can be determined.

C. Acceptance of copy: Library of Congress copy is accepted for use in Northwestern's catalogs without undue scrutiny. All access points in LC copy (main and added entries, series, subjects, and titles) are examined for accuracy and consistency with NUL's catalogs. Non-access fields are generally accepted as is, with minimal attention.

The acceptance of LC cataloging copy carries certain risks. Errors in tagging, transcription, or judgement which occur on LC cataloging are not always caught, and may thus appear on NOTIS. This is especially true for records which have updated CIP (Cataloging In Publication) cataloging copy. The Catalog Department regrets the errors which are thus incorporated into NOTIS, but the cost of detailed examination of LC copy greatly diminishes the advantages of using it, and cannot be justified. Errors or discrepancies which result from acceptance of LC copy are corrected in accordance with PPM573d-f when they are noticed. Library staff are encouraged to report problems of this sort to Catalog Management.

Northwestern University

COPY CATALOGING: A POSITION REPORT

Northwestern University Library has been using Library of Congress cataloging copy, first in manual form, and then from MARC tapes, for decades. Cataloging items with LC copy is less expensive and faster than doing original cataloging, and especially in years past, Library of Congress cataloging copy was often of higher quality, and was almost always regarded as "more authoritative" than cataloging produced locally.

Some years ago, in a conscious break with a past "regime" which had stressed production at the expense of quality, and responding to a perception of what was desired by the Library both locally and in its national context, the Catalog Department developed an atmosphere in which quality began to be stressed at least equally with speed. Error-free cataloging was highly praised, as was the ability to detect and correct mistakes found on LC cataloging. Copy catalogers at Northwestern did more than simply accept LC cataloging copy, they checked it carefully to see if it could be improved upon, and they exercised great care in heading usage and establishment. The end product was of extremely high quality, and matched the greatly increased quality of our original cataloging.

A backlog of uncataloged materials existed, but it was of long standing, was composed largely of materials which required original cataloging, and it did not seem to grow precipitously except during years of special stress (such as the year NOTIS 3 was introduced), or in special areas (such as Africana). Items with copy were not backlogged, but were sent directly to Copy Cataloging Section. Over the years, through periodic adjustments of workflow, cataloging practices, priorities, etc., copy cataloging production was maintained in approximate balance with the number of items received to be copy cataloged. As recently as 1979, funds for additional copy cataloging staff were sometimes found, and through a variety of special projects to locate heretofore undiscovered or unused copy from the arrearages, the main backlogs were actually reduced slightly.

In the past half decade, maintenance of the balance between copy cataloging and receipts has become increasingly difficult. The complexity of LC copy has increased, the MARC format is more sophisticated, and our own processing system demands more of copy catalogers than formerly. Such matters as maintenance of the online catalog, online authority work, delays in obtaining CIP (Cataloging in Publication) copy, etc. have heightened the difficulty of the job. AACR2 implementation, a multiple year process, has added another layer of tasks.

As part of the continuing attempt to maintain equilibrium between staff available and work to be done, in 1979 a major reduction in the amount of scrutiny given to the LC MARC

copy used in cataloging was instituted.* Despite this and other efforts to increase efficiency, demands made upon copy catalogers have reached the point where production is no longer keeping pace with copy cataloging receipts, and a backlog of MARC copy is building.

It is clear that however much we may need them, more staff are not to be expected. In times of budgetary restraint, all Departmental functions and assumptions are subject to examination. Just as the basic level of original cataloging has been questioned (resulting in a pilot program in minimal level (LEVEL 1) cataloging), copy cataloging is also subject to scrutiny.

It has always been the case that some of the benefit derived from using another library's cataloging is lost when copy is not accepted as it comes, but in less demanding times the result was considered worth the cost. I believe that the cost is now too great, and propose a more rigorous definition of the policy of accepting LC copy as a means of increasing departmental productivity, perhaps to decrease the backlogs (through locating "undiscovered" copy, adapting variant copy, increasing use of manual copy, etc.). The shift will involve changes in attitude within the Department, and perhaps also without. It will require alteration of existing routines and some retraining, but the effort will be small in comparison to possible benefits.

I propose that we further emphasize the need to accept LC copy as it comes, including machine tagging, choice of entry points, choice and formulation of the body and the notes, fixed field coding, input quality, etc. The only exceptions being that access points (main and added entries, series tracings, subject headings), title transcription, and imprint and edition information will still be carefully checked for correctness and for conformity with NUL's catalogs, and the classification number will be formulated using a suggested number as a guide rather than as a prescription. <u>All other areas of an LC MARC record will not be read, even for typographical errors</u>. Errors incorporated into NOTIS will be corrected according to normal correction routines, and will not be considered to reflect upon the quality of work performed.

Library of Congress cataloging copy is not error-free. Typographical errors, tagging mistakes, oversights, inconsistencies, illogicalities, etc. are frequently encountered. It was the number of errors in LC copy which led to our habits of scrutinizing and "improving on" LC cataloging. Further lessening of the examination these records receive during cataloging will increase the number of effors in in NOTIS. The bulk of LC cataloging, however, contains few if any errors. The cost of catching and correcting the mistakes which do occur in non-access fields is too great to justify the effort expended.

---

*Recorded in Catalog Department Memorandum 79-2 and PPM574

Catalog Department staff are trained to be very concerned with the quality of their product. Their sensibilities will for a time be bruised by being asked to ignore problems which they know to exist. It is important that they and other Library staff understand that there has been administrative agreement that the problem of acceptance of LC-derived errors into NOTIS is outweighed by the need to speed copy cataloging.

The proposal is neither a deviation from NUL policy on the use of Library of Congress copy, nor is it a drastic break with past practice. It is instead one more step in a continuing reinterpretation of what it means to "accept" LC copy. In the early 1970s, NUL produced copy cataloging which was located approximately three quarters of the way to "perfection" on the continuum that stretches between the best possible and the cheapest possible cataloging. The restrictions on examination of copy which have been made since that time have us still over the half-way mark. Practices which could result from current discussions could place us almost two-thirds of the way to the other end. Given time and experience, we may discover that a further slide is possible.

I have presented this subject in a rather dramatic way. I must point out, however, that although what I propose will require a major shift in attitude, and should increase productivity measurably, the increase will not be miraculous. By severely limiting inspection of LC copy while retaining requirements for heading control, we are following an existing trend. The most time consuming (and the most vital) part of the job has been left more-or-less intact. Elimination of this aspect of copy cataloging would cause a severe disservice to both patron and staff users of the NOTIS database, and is therefore not proposed.

Some of the types of errors in LC copy which might be expected to show up if scrutiny is decreased:

-- typographical errors and mistranscriptions in the body (excluding the title), in the collation, in the notes

-- Repeated, incomplete, or unintelligible notes

-- Incorrect or incomplete collation

-- Some types of "other title information" missing (such as other contributors to a work, "cooperating" organizations, etc.

-- Added entries made without "justification" in the description

-- Additional places of publication, publishers, distributors, printers, etc. missing

-- Improper tagging of fieds, especially note fields, collation, etc. Improper coding of fixed fields

-- Inconsistency in inclusion of notes recording miscellaneous information such as "at head of title", notes explaining the relationship of a work to other works, etc.

Northwestern University

RLIN COPY CATALOGING

Catalog Department Memorandum
84-1 (EJ)
March 7, 1983

Subject: Guidelines for the use and modification of RLIN member copy for cataloging

GENERAL

RLIN member copy is used in cataloging when no LC copy is found, and in preference to performing original cataloging. In general, when using RLIN copy the cataloger is guided by the standards observed in the use of non-MARC LC copy. Additionally, certain areas in the copy such as the subject tracings may require more attention and more work than is the case with LC copy.

The guidelines presented below are designed to produce a cataloging record that conforms to NUL practices, and whose headings integrate successfully into the NOTIS/LUIS indexes. Although the quality of a NOTIS record created from RLIN copy is important, catalogers must remember that the close examination of RLIN copy to make minor changes in it tends to defeat the purpose for which copy is used ... that is, the saving of time and money.

GUIDELINES.

1. Selecting a record:
When searching the RLIN database select from a cluster of records one that was created by a RLG member.

2. Fixed fields:
To code the fixed fields in the NOTIS record copy the values in the RLIN record using, if necessary, a table of equivalent fixed field headings. Correct and update, as necessary.

3. LCN (010)
The presence of an LCN in an RLIN record does not necessarily indicate LC copy. Transcribe the LCN to the NOTIS record in the same way as the SBN (see #4).

4. SBN (020)
Transcribe the data in the 020 field in the RLIN record to the NOTIS SBN field, provided the ISBN is for the edition/issue in hand. If there is no 020 field in the source record or if the SBN is for a variant edition or issue and an ISBN is in the piece, supply the SBN from the piece. Add the price in the 'c' subfield when it is easily

determined and only for works published within the last three years.

5. CAS (040)
Construct the CAS as follows:
$a (NUC symbol of the cataloging agency) $c IEN $d IEN (as appropriate)

6. GAC (043)
Copy into the GAC the codes in the 043 field in the RLIN copy, or supply the GAC based on an examination of the subject headings or the piece in hand, as appropriate.

7. Description.
Transcribe the data in the descriptive areas of the RLIN copy. Check the copy for completeness, accuracy and coding. Make corrections as necessary. Some descriptive fields (particularly note fields) frequently appear in the 'wrong order' in the source copy. When transcribing these fields put them in the correct order.

8. Headings:

a. Author and title headings
Search the headings on NOTIS, etc., resolve conflicts and perform authority work, following standard procedures. For special conditions that only apply to RLIN copy, see below.

If the heading is new to NUL and does not require authority work, accept it.

If the heading is new to NUL and requires authority work, search LC for an authority record. If no LC authority record exists, generally accept the heading and perform authority work.

If an RLIN member-established AACR2 heading conflicts with a NUL established AA2 heading and LC does not resolve the conflict, retain the NUL heading and perform the necessary authority work.

If the RLIN record contains an AACR2 heading that conflicts with a NUL pre-AACR2 heading and LC does not resolve the conflict, evaluate the heading for correctness of form and if it is judged 'sound', use it.

Perform necessary authority work and initiate the correction of the NUL headings following standard procedures.

b. Subject headings
All headings (including topical) must be searched on NOTIS. Headings may also have to be checked in LCSH and other sources to determine current usage. For commonly encountered heading changes refer also to CDM 82-23. As appropriate, initiate changes on NOTIS and perform the necessary authority work for non-topical subject headings.

If judged necessary, enhance subject access with additional subject headings. Cataloging with RLIN copy may require that the cataloger pay more attention to the subject analysis than is customary with LC copy.

The order of the subject headings in RLIN records is often a problem; be aware of this, especially when classifying the work.

9. Holdings record.
The copy and volumes holdings records are prepared in accordance with standard practices. The cataloging source/level note in the title level note position contains the code 'n' to show that RLIN is the source of the cataloging copy. e.g. n:CAK

Northwestern Univ.

LC COPY--USE IN COPY CATALOGING

Catalog Department Memorandum
No. 79-2 (JSH)
April 17, 1979

SUBJECT: Acceptance and examination of LC copy used in monographic copy cataloging

In order to make cataloging of individual items as inexpensive, fast, and easy as possible, the Catalog Department accepts and uses Library of Congress cataloging copy and/or practice whenever it can be obtained or ascertained, so long as it does not interfere with processing priorities or the retrievability of any item. To realize the greatest benefit from this policy the practice of copy cataloging was set up and a separate Copy Cataloging Section was created. Copy cataloging is performed both within this special section, and to a lesser extent in the other cataloging units.

I. Primary fields and Secondary fields
For the purposes of copy cataloging, the data elements of a cataloging record are divided into two types.

A. Primary fields
These are the fields in which an error might significantly affect the retrievability and/or identification of a work. Primary fields include the Main and all Added Entries, including Title, Series, and Subject Tracings, and the body of the entry from the Title through the Imprint, and including the Series Statement. The NUL Classification Number, which is not "copied" but created by the cataloger, is also considered to be a Primary field.*

B. Secondary fields
All remaining fields are considered to be Secondary. Errors inadvertently retained from LC cataloging copy in these fields do not significantly affect either the retrievability or the identification of a work. Secondary fields include the Fixed Field and Associated Data, the Physical Description area, Notes, and the LC Classification numbers.*

Examination of these fields is carried out as follows:

II. For copy cataloging performed in Copy Cataloging Section

A. Cataloging with MARC copy for the work in hand:
This is the most straightforward type of cataloging and allows for

* The NUL classification number is Primary because it is an access point, but it is not copied from LC data as are the other fields. The LC classification numbers, on the other hand, are of negligible importance in the record, and are never altered. They are examined, if at all, only for the guidance they may afford in the construction of our own call number.

the most complete implementation of the principle of accepting LC copy. In "worksheet order" data fields are checked as follows:

1. The cataloger begins examination of the record at the Main Entry fields, ignoring for the time being all information above. All fields from Main Entry through the Imprint, and including the Series Statement are examined closely.

2. The fields from the Collation through all Notes are skimmed briefly, usually without comparing the data to the work being cataloged. Obvious errors (such as typographical errors, notes repeated, etc.) are corrected if noticed. Senseless or incorrect notes (such as Bibliography:) are dealt with. Errors in LC copy not caught by the cataloger may also not be detected in review. LC errors in these fields which may be caught in the review process are not considered to be mistakes made by the copy cataloger.

3. All Added Entry fields are given close scrutiny. Subject Heading examination is done within the limits of copy cataloging, but all headings are checked for typographical errors and tagging, and certain defined groups of headings are routinely altered.

4. If alteration or study of material in a Primary field renders data in a Secondary field inaccurate, that data is revised.

Copy .Cataloging

B. Cataloging with non-Marc LC copy for the work in hand (Direct Input)
Close examination is made of all Primary fields. In addition, fixed field and associated data are supplied. Secondary fields usually do not require more than the simple review prescribed above. The cataloger may sometimes have to exercise judgement in determining if some areas deserve special attention. e.g. If the record is not already input the cataloger may decide that lengthy Contents notes are not important enough to justify keying the extended text. Data input by Search are not subjected to closer examination than MARC data. For records which have been only partially input, the cataloger must attend to the secondary fields in order that they are included in the machine record.

C. Cataloging performed with Variant Edition (VE) copy
Since the cataloging copy is not for the work in hand, all data elements in VE copy must be examined closely, and the piece being cataloged must also be inspected to determine the differences from the cataloging copy. In addition to the normal examination of the Primary fields, special care must also be taken with the Collation and the Notes. The LCN must be changed, as well as the Standard Book Number (if any), and any other data element may have to be modified so as to reflect the item being cataloged at NUL.

III. For copy cataloging performed outside Copy Cataloging Section

The principle of acceptance of copy governs copy cataloging no matter where performed or by whom, but certain types of materials may demand special attention to fields not normally given the closest scrutiny.

A. Special Collections copy cataloging
Although the aspect of a work which has caused it to be selected for Special Collections might frequently not interfere with the fullest application of practices pertaining to "mainstream" copy cataloging, there is no way to make this determination accurately until after the cataloging has been performed. Copy cataloging for Special Collections material involves the careful inspection of both the copy and the work being cataloged, and the verification of all data elements. In addition to checking the validity of information which already appears in the catalog record, other fields often have to be added (e.g. special series, notes for authors' autographs, etc.) in order to satisfy the requirements of Special Collections staff and their specialized clientele.

B. Africana copy cataloging
Generally copy cataloging performed for Africana materials follows the guidelines set for Copy Cataloging Section. There may be certain fields, however, which because of the source of the material may require special attention from time to time, in order to monitor the general accuracy of LC copy. (e.g. the Geographic Area Code may be especially prone to error).

C. Slavica copy cataloging
The guidelines set for Copy Cataloging Section are followed as closely as possible for Slavica materials, except that special attention must usually be paid to make sure that there are no errors in Romanization in any of the Primary fields.

D. Copy cataloging performed in General Monographic Cataloging
Copy cataloging performed by professional catalogers has generally been assigned to them because of problems with the copy, or for purposes of instruction of the cataloger. It is therefore impossible to predict which fields will deserve full attention and which should only receive a quick proofreading. Original catalogers are directed, however, to remember the premises of fast, inexpensive, and generally uncomplicated cataloging under which the practices of copy cataloging were devised, and to give no field any more attention than it deserves.

For special instructions on individual aspects of copy cataloging, see
CDM 79-3 Contents notes in copy cataloging
CDM 82-22 Subject Heading Policy
CDM 82-23 Subject Heading Policy--Appendix

For the general policy on Acceptance of LC copy and practice, see
PPM Use of Library of Congress cataloging

For definitions of Copy Cataloging, Direct Input, etc, see CDM
(not yet written)

Additional filing terms:
. Copy cataloging
Direct Input copy cataloging
VE copy cataloging
Variant Edition copy cataloging

Northwestern University

LEVEL 1 CATALOGING

Catalog Department Memorandum
82-12 (JSH)
June 25, 1982 (r.2/28/83)

SUBJECT: Standards for LEVEL 1 (Minimal Level Cataloging)

1. Not all titles handled in the Catalog Department receive full cataloging. Certain types of materials receive only the minimum treatment necessary for NOTIS processing (such catalog records are sometimes referred to as "partial" or "skeleton" records), while others are given LEVEL 1 cataloging. LEVEL 1 is an NUL standard based upon requirements for Minimal Level Cataloging (MLC) as laid out in the National Level Bibliographic Record--Books (NLBR), and as further defined for RLIN.

2. The following are used in LEVEL 1 cataloging.

E/LEV	Leader:17	=7 (preliminary)
DCF	Leader:18	DCF refers to both cataloging style and headings used. If all headings are AACR2, DCF = a. If any heading (including any subject) is non-AACR2, DCF = ?
SRC	008:39	=d (non-LC)
PLACE	008:15	Code
LANG	008:35-37	Code
D/CODE	008:6	Code
DT/1	008:7-10	Encode
DT/2	008:11-14	Encode
LCN	010:	Encode if present
SBN	020:	Include $a only (or, rarely, $z)
LBC	039:	Level of Bibliographic Description. Code $a = 1 $b = 2 (Less than full) $c = Usually 0 (No attempt made to assign subject heading, or 2 (general subject heading assigned) $d = 3 (even if form or dummy call no. used) $e = 2 (most necessary)
CAS	040:	= $a IEN
GAC	043:	Optional
MEx	1xx:	Main entry, if applicable
TIL	245:	Title Statement: $a - Title proper $b - Subtitle. Include only if subtitle is necessary to distinguish among titles, if the title proper is meaningless, misleading, etc. without it, or if desired as variant title tracing $c - First statement of responsibility,

		if different from main entry heading in form or number, or if there is no main entry heading (1.0D1). Include joint author, but not editors, compilers, translators, illustrators, etc. $n - Number of part (rarely encountered) $p - Name of part (rarely encountered) 1st indicator: (Title added entry) 2nd indicator: (Nonfiling indicator)
EDN	250:	Include if present. $a only
IMP	260:	Imprint: $a - First Place of publication only $b - First Name of publisher only $c - Primary Date of publication only
COL	300:	Collation: $a only. Single pagination if readily ascertained, otherwise number of volumes. $c is not included, but be alert to potential Large and Folio items.
SET	440:	Use for simple traced series titles. See 3b below for series heading and tracing standards.
SER	490:	Use for untraced series or for series traced differently, or for series deliberately not established. See 3b(3) below.
NOx	5xx:	Notes are discouraged, but not forbidden. Examples of notes that might be included are the original title of a translation; the language if the record is otherwise misleading; the presence of a bibliography that predominates in the work, etc. See 3. below for guidelines.
SUx	6xx:	Subjects. General headings are assigned to some materials. e.g. art exhibition catalogs generally receive a subject heading for a single artist. See 3c below.
AEx	7xx:	Added entries. A single personal or corporate a.e. is usually made if m.e. is title. Otherwise, generally do not make personal or corporate added entries. AED/740 entries for variant titles are made liberally.
SAx	8xx:	Use whichever 8xx field is appropriate when a traced series is not correctly coded SET/440. See 3b below.
CALL NUMBER		Supply. See 5 below.
ID		LEVEL 1 records are indicated by m. e.g. m:JHL

3. Augmentation of LEVEL 1 Records

The primary purpose of LEVEL 1 cataloging is to increase the number of titles cataloged by decreasing the amount of effort expended on individual titles. Since any augmentation of a LEVEL 1 record decreases the impact of the LEVEL 1 program, the inclusion of any information beyond that specified above is discouraged. There are instances, however, when the addition of a piece of information that is obvious to the cataloger would increase the usefulness of the record out of all proportion to the effort involved. In such cases, especially where the cataloging record would be misleading without the addition, the cataloger may include the information. For example:

A work that is 85% illustrations would be more fairly represented if the collation included a $b chiefly ill. The information is obvious to the cataloger, and involves little effort to include. It may be added

A work whose title, etc. conveys the impression that the work is in French, while the actual text is in Arabic would be more fairly represented if a language note were included. The information is obvious to the cataloger, and the formulation of the note involves little effort. The note may be added.

Care must be taken in LEVEL 1 cataloging not to add to the record information just because it is easily determined. It must be both easily determined and necessary to be included. Catalogers must use judgement. When in doubt about the usefulness of a piece of information, do NOT include it. When a piece of supplementary information would require effort to determine, do NOT include it.

NOTE: Pages 1 and 2 are being reissued as a result of revisions on 2/28/83. PULL pages 1 and 2 dated June 24, 1982, and REPLACE with new pages 1,2,2b. RENUMBER all items following this paragraph.

4. Searching and heading standards for LEVEL 1 cataloging:

The NLBR standard was written with the assumption that description and headings would be AACR2. Thus DCF = a is understood to mean that both description and headings are AACR2. Only LEVEL 1 records with DCF = a may be suitable for inclusion in RLIN.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Access for Users

Report of the Working Group on Minimal Level Cataloging and Processing Priorities

February 29, 1984

Barbara von Wahlde, Chair
Peggy Daub
Maurita Holland
Bob Houbeck
Liz Reidy
Bob Starring
Mary Townsend
Patricia Yocum

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction to the Work of the Group: Problem Statement	1
Brief Record Cataloging: a Proposal	4
Summary Statement	15
Selected Bibliography	16

Appendices

- Backlog activity report
- Memo on authority work
- Sample card sets
- Allocation plan for original cataloging
- FRN description & process
- Workflow schematic diagram
- Memo on minimal level cataloging test

NOT IN KIT

Background Documents

1. What other libraries are doing
2. Chart of standards, requirements, and proposals

INTRODUCTION

Problem Identification

The Working Group was named October 20, 1982 and charged with the development of an action plan which would utilize some form of minimal level or brief record cataloging as a strategy for diminishing or, at the very least, stabilizing the number of items in the cataloging backlog at the University of Michigan Library. Several factors have contributed to the growth of the backlog: personnel budget reductions have shrunk original cataloging staff from nine permanent FTE to five FTE over five years while funds for the purchase of materials have been maintained at levels sufficient to meet the upward inflationary spiral; technology has not offered solutions by accelerating productivity or by providing useable cataloging copy in quantities that would control backlog growth; and Library of Congress cataloging output has decreased. Further, cataloging rules (AACR II) and network (RLIN) requirements are such that original catalogers produce on the average of one title per hour.

The complexities associated with brief record cataloging and interrelated issues have stretched the Working Group's life from weeks to months. Readings and discussions have succeeded in raising questions that have no easy solutions. At the same time Technical Services has taken some action to ease the backlog problem. GL books lacking cataloging copy have been consolidated in Room 22, organized in accession number order and entered on GEAC. The divisional libraries backlog has been retained by library location in Room 100 and organized by pre-catalog search date. Two searching projects have been initiated, one for GL materials and the other for divisional library materials. Both have resulted in locating cataloging copy for some books, which have subsequently been cataloged. Creation of the Automated Cataloging unit has also expedited copy cataloging. Nonetheless, the GL backog currently exceeds 20,000 volumes while the Divisional backlog consists of over 3800 volumes (see Appendix A). While items have been removed from both backlogs, new ones have been added. Thus, the problem remains: How should the University of Michigan Library handle newly received monograph titles for which no cataloging copy is available on RLIN?

Major problems or questions that have surfaced in the course of discussions over the past months and which require resolution are:

1. Should a brief record be applied across the system to divisional library materials as well as those in the Graduate Library?

2. Are we taking into account all of the salient factors in arriving at our decision?

   a. Diverse nature of materials.

   b. Diverse use of materials from discipline to discipline.

   c. User population's needs--currency of content, historical surveys, combinations of both.

3. What elements should a brief record include?

4. Should items treated with a brief record be classified?

5. Should there be subject access?

6. Is it important that brief records "cluster" in RLIN?

7. Shall we plan to include all the data elements necessary for RLIN Fuller Record Notification (FRN)?

8. Will the brief record decided upon substantially reduce cataloging time?

9. Are there categories of materials that lend themselves to brief treatment?

10. Are the associated costs in using a brief, non-standard, record tolerable? To reverse the question, "What price do we pay by using a brief record?"

11. Should the use of GEAC to handle backlogs be expanded?

12. How do RLG/RLIN discussions of shared cataloging figure into the larger problem of diminished availability of cataloging copy?

13. What authority work is necessary in creating a brief record?

14. What cycle should be used in searching backlogs for copy? Do language, subject, place of publication, date of publication affect searching cycles? Is there a time span beyond which re-searches become pointless?

These represent many but far from all of the thorny issues the Working Group has had to weigh. They were ultimately considered in light of the concepts that the Library Collection is a whole whose parts are made accessible through a union catalog. To maintain each and to produce maximum

Major problems or questions that have surfaced in the course of discussions over the past months and which require resolution are:

1. Should a brief record be applied across the system to divisional library materials as well as those in the Graduate Library?

2. Are we taking into account all of the salient factors in arriving at our decision?

   a. Diverse nature of materials.

   b. Diverse use of materials from discipline to discipline.

   c. User population's needs--currency of content, historical surveys, combinations of both.

3. What elements should a brief record include?

4. Should items treated with a brief record be classified?

5. Should there be subject access?

6. Is it important that brief records "cluster" in RLIN?

7. Shall we plan to include all the data elements necessary for RLIN Fuller Record Notification (FRN)?

8. Will the brief record decided upon substantially reduce cataloging time?

9. Are there categories of materials that lend themselves to brief treatment?

10. Are the associated costs in using a brief, non-standard, record tolerable? To reverse the question, "What price do we pay by using a brief record?"

11. Should the use of GEAC to handle backlogs be expanded?

12. How do RLG/RLIN discussions of shared cataloging figure into the larger problem of diminished availability of cataloging copy?

13. What authority work is necessary in creating a brief record?

14. What cycle should be used in searching backlogs for copy? Do language, subject, place of publication, date of publication affect searching cycles? Is there a time span beyond which re-searches become pointless?

These represent many but far from all of the thorny issues the Working Group has had to weigh. They were ultimately considered in light of the concepts that the Library Collection is a whole whose parts are made accessible through a union catalog. To maintain each and to produce maximum

benefit for scholarship, new material and its bibliography should be incorporated into the existing system rather than separated from it. These concepts, then, guided the development of a proposal to use Brief Record Cataloging on a trial basis and to evaluate the results of the experiment at the end of twelve months.

BRIEF RECORD CATALOGING

A Proposal

I. PURPOSE

Research libraries often acquire material for which neither machine readable cataloging copy nor sufficient full original cataloging capacity is available. When these conditions obtain, it is important, nonetheless, to make that material permanently and efficiently available at a reasonable cost to the institution and in a timely manner to the end user for whom it has been acquired.

To achieve these ends the University of Michigan Minimal Level Cataloging Group proposes a one year experimental program for Brief Record Cataloging (RLIN-Non-Standard). The program is designed to meet the following objectives:

- Provide direct user access to the material.
- Incorporate the material into the general collections.
- Provide a bibliographic record in the card catalog as well as via an automated system.
- Minimize the staff effort required to handle this material over its lifetime in the University of Michigan.

The study would concentrate on providing answers to these questions:

- Does BRC (Brief Record Cataloging) make material directly available to users?
  - Save staff time?
  - Greatly diminish the pre-cataloging backlog?
  - Produce a useable bibliographic record?
  - Provide sufficient bibliographic access for users?
  - Speed books through the cataloging process?
- What kinds of material should receive BRC?
- Is authority work necessary? If so, at what point in the cataloging process should it be done?

II. BRC DATA ELEMENTS

For Brief Record Cataloging, the following data elements are prepared from the piece:

1. Author or editor
2. Title
3. Publication place, date
4. Publisher
5. Series (for numbered series)
6. One subject heading
7. Call number
8. ISBN
9. Cataloging category
10. Bibliographic record and type
11. Country of publication
12. Language (of publication)
13. Type of publication date code
14. Date of publication
15. Cataloging source code
16. Library ID (MiU)

} Control fields; essential RLIN machine requirements.

For Fuller Record Notification (FRN), should it be desired, the following additional data elements must be entered:

17. Sub-title
18. Edition statement
19. LC card number
20. Pagination

III. AUTHORITY WORK

The Group recognizes the need for some minimal authority work on BRC records and recommends the following (see also Appendix B):

1. Names: Search author/editor or issuing corporate body in Public Catalog. a) Use form of name as found in Public; or b) for names new to the University of Michigan catalogs, establish name from the item in hand.

2. Series: Check all numbered series against Authority File. Use established form of series. Series new to our catalogs will go to Serials Cataloging for establishment of series form.

3. Subjects: In establishing subjects, follow the LCSH form. Rely on "bounces" at point of filing to catch inconsistent forms.

IV. CARDS PRODUCED

The following cards would be produced for all appropriate catalogs (see Appendix C for sample cards):

- Main entry
- Title added entry
- Subject
- Shelf list

V. RESPONSIBILITY TO RLG

As a member of RLG, the University of Michigan shares a concern for the quality of the RLIN database and a commitment to RLG programs. In an acceptable form, Brief Record Cataloging would enter into RLIN titles which do not currently appear. In so doing, BRC would:

- provide a basic record which member libraries could copy or upon which they could build;

- promote resource sharing by indicating University of Michigan ownership, especially of esoteric material;

- promote cooperative collection development by entering titles already owned.

Like all RLG members, the University of Michigan has, in the least, an ethical responsibility for contributing some portion of full original cataloging to RLIN. To fulfill this responsibility the Group proposes that a percent of all original cataloging effort be devoted to full original cataloging. Furthermore, the Group proposes that this percentage be concentrated in selected, important subjects which currently are not well addressed by the prevailing national cataloging effort. Thus, the University of Michigan could commit itself to the full original cataloging of all monographs it acquires in a few designated subjects. On a national level this contribution would be significant. It would:

- contribute to the national bibliography;
- provide copy for RLG-member libraries;
- evidence leadership in breaking the "backlog" syndrome whereby research libraries hold their uncataloged material in abeyance hoping that someone else will provide cataloging copy;
- test the principle of shared cataloging;
- relieve other RLG libraries of investing substantial cataloging effort in the designated subjects, thus freeing them to concentrate their energies on other subjects in a reciprocal benefit to the University of Michigan.

On a local level, concentrating original cataloging effort would:

- provide conventional bibliographical data for certain University of Michigan material;
- establish a system of priority cataloging;
- retain a full original cataloging capacity by providing catalogers with the opportunity to exercise and develop a full range of skills.

Full original cataloging for all other subjects would still be available but at a reduced rate. (See Appendix D for a model.)

VI. PROCEDURE

Newly acquired monographs would be handled as follows:

1. Book arrives in Acquisitions. If the pre-order RLIN search indicates that useable cataloging copy exists, the book is forwarded to the Automated Cataloging Unit.

2. If the pre-order search is negative, the book is pre-catalog searched. If copy is found, the book is sent to the Automated Cataloging Unit for copy cataloging.

3. Books for which no copy is found are forwarded to Original Cataloging and earmarked for either Full Original Cataloging or Brief Record Cataloging according to criteria and mechanisms yet to be established. (See Section VII for a discussion of some of these factors.)

4. Books designated for Full Original Cataloging are handled in the standard way.

5. All others are cataloged according to BRC specifications. Data elements are entered into RLIN as non-standard records. Catalog cards are produced for all specified access points for all catalogs affected in the same manner as catalog cards are produced for fully cataloged materials.

6. BRC books are labelled with their call numbers, forwarded to their holding locations, and intershelved with the classified collection.

7. During the one year experiment all BRC books are tagged for Fuller Record Notification (FRN). (See Appendix E for a description of FRN.) Data subsequently collected would be examined for:

   - type and amount of material receiving BRC;
   - type and amount of material for which full cataloging copy was subsequently provided by RLIN;
   - patterns of time intervals between receipt of material at the University of Michigan and appearance of full cataloging copy on RLIN;
   - cost and appropriateness of upgrading BRC cataloging to full cataloging when copy becomes available.

Notes: 1. Rush and course reserve books which have no cataloging copy would automatically receive BRC. Books lacking copy and requested by patrons would also receive BRC automatically. All would move directly to the head of the BRC queue.

2. The proposed experiment provides for a working backlog of books awaiting some form of Original Cataloging. Material would enter this backlog after a negative pre-catalog search and exit cataloged either fully or BRC no more than two or three weeks later. During their short stay in this working backlog, most books could be located via Innovacq. Those books received on standing order could be added to Innovacq if the Library wants detailed "in process" control of all books. As at present all would "drop off" Innovacq when they are cataloged either fully or BRC. In the interim, Innovacq would function as the locating tool, much as GEAC does now for the GL managed backlog. (For a schematic diagram of the workflow see Appendix F.)

VII. PROJECTED ACTIVITY

1. Number of volumes received each year for which no cataloging copy is available after the pre-order search and one pre-cataloging search:

   10,000-12,000 titles

2. Estimated adjusted annual original cataloging capacity (present monograph cataloging professional staff only):

   5,000 hours

   (See Appendix D for calculation.)

3. Projected annual distribution of original cataloging capacity.

   Under the proposal original cataloging effort is divided between Full Original Cataloging and Brief Record Cataloging. The proportions to be afforded each will vary as a function of three factors:

   1. The number of titles which need original cataloging.
   2. The rate at which BRC can be done.
   3. The number of catalogers available.

   In essence, the lower the number of titles needing original cataloging, or the faster the rate per hour of BRC or the larger the original cataloging staff, the greater the percentage of Full Original Cataloging. (See Table, Appendix D.) Given the current collecting activity of the University of Michigan Library, as well as the prevailing national cataloging effort, the Group believes that the number of titles to receive Full Original Cataloging should not fall below 1,500 annually. Further, it is desirable to raise this number whenever possible while assuring that all other material receives BRC.

Assuming the constraints indicated in numbers 1 and 2 and based on testing (see Appendix G), the projected optimal and minimal distribution of original cataloging effort would be as follows:

Optimal

10,000 titles per year lacking copy
5,000 hours of original cataloging effort available
6 titles per hour rate in BRC
1,000 hours for BRC = 6,000 titles BRC
4,000 hours for full = 4,000 titles fully cataloged

Minimal

12,000 titles per year lacking copy
5,000 hours per year of original cataloging effort
3 titles per hour in BRC
3,500 hours for BRC = 10,500 titles BRC
1,500 hours for full = 1,500 titles fully cataloged

Median

11,000 titles per year lacking copy
5,000 hours per year of original cataloging effort
4.5 titles per hour in BRC
1,716 hours for BRC = 7,720 titles BRC
3,280 hours for full = 3,280 titles fully cataloged

VIII. PROJECTED COSTS

A. New RLIN charges

These charges would be incurred by entering BRC on RLIN. They would not occur if BRC materials were left uncataloged.

1. Charge for entering title on RLIN @ $2.39 per title. Includes FRN tag.

Low	6,000 titles entered	$14,340
High	10,500 titles entered	$25,095

2. RLIN cards @ $.037 per card with one card per access point (i.e. one card for m.e., one card for subject, etc.)

Low	6,000 titles receive cards	$1,184
High	10,500 titles receive cards	$2,072

(Computed on a four card set for GL and eight card set for divisionals)

3. Fuller Record Notification (FRN).

Notice produced costs $.26. Subsequent maintenance charge, when it applies, costs $.78 per title. For budgeting purposes, assume that all FRN notices produced will result in upgraded copy and incur a maintenance charge to the record. (Recent retrospective searching of backlogs at the University of Michigan indicates that a hit rate of no more than 50% from all sources can be expected.)

Low

If 10% of 6,000 BRC titles receive FRN notices and copy is upgraded

	Notice	Maintenance	Total
600 titles upgraded	$ 156	$ 468	$ 624

High

If 50% of 10,500 BRC titles receive FRN notices and copy is upgraded

5,250 titles upgraded	$1,365	$4,095	$5,460

4. Tape charges

Entering items onto RLIN tape @ $.047 per transaction.

a. BRC entry

Low	6,000 titles	$282.00
High	10,500 titles	$493.50

b. BRC conversion to upgraded records after FRN notice

Low

If 10% of 6,000 titles are upgraded
600 titles upgraded $28.20

High

If 50% of 10,500 titles are upgraded
5,250 titles upgraded $246.75

5. Aggregated new RLIN costs (numbers 1 through 4)

Low	$16,458.20
High	$33,367.25

B. Staff

1. Catalogers

The proposal is built around the current original Monograph Cataloging capacity which is budgeted at five permanent full time catalogers. This capacity provides opportunity to meet minimal and optimal ratios of full and BRC cataloging. Added duties, extended leave and vacancies, however, diminish the annual capacity and alter the potential ratios. Therefore, the Group believes that the effective original cataloging capacity should be no less than that budgeted. Further, the Group recommends that a sixth position be budgeted in order to achieve a more desirable mix of cataloging types and, in the least, serve as insurance against those times when capacity is reduced by added duties, extended leave or vacancy.

2. Support staff

No increased costs for support staff are anticipated in the cataloging process.

C. Innovacq

Should the Library decide to use Innovacq as an in-process control tool for items in the working backlog, monographs received on standing order would need to be entered into Innovacq. At present no estimate of the number of titles affected is available.

D. Filing in card catalog

1. BRC cards to be filed @ 125 cards per hour (estimated Public Catalog rate) @ $4.48/hr.

Low

6,000 titles receive BRC $1146

High

10,500 titles receive BRC $2007

2. BRC cards to be pulled @ 40 cards per hour (estimated Public Catalog rate) @ $4.48/hr. if FRN notices arrive and copy is upgraded.

Low

If 10% of 6,000 BRC titles receive FRN notices and copy is upgraded

600 titles upgraded $ 358

High

If 50% of 10,500 BRC titles receive FRN notices and copy is upgraded

5,250 titles upgraded $3,136

3. Filing new cards for fully cataloged items upgraded from BRC

Low	600 titles upgraded	$ 458
High	5,250 titles upgraded	$4,014

Aggregated filing costs 1-3.

Low	High
$1,962	$9,157

IX. PROJECTED SAVINGS

The principal savings to be realized by the Library would come in the area of personnel costs by suspending or reducing certain activities.

1. Second and subsequent manual pre-cataloging searches on RLIN would no longer be necessary. FRN's would do the job automatically.

2. Manual entry, change, and upgrade of GL backlog on GEAC would cease for new material because it would not be added to the present GL backlog. All newly cataloged materials would appear on GEAC when the RLIN tapes are loaded.

3. The need for mediated access to the backlogs would diminish.

4. Costs for repeated handling especially for shelving and shifting backlogs would diminish as would those stemming from the periodic need to create new room to house the backlogs separately.

5. Less Locater effort would be needed to find items at the request of individual users or other Library units.

6. Mediated patron query at public service points regarding ordered books would decrease as would the Public Service effort needed to handle it.

7. Because fewer titles would receive full cataloging, the cost of RLIN card sets would decrease proportionately.

Some of these costs are currently included in routine operations. All can probably be studied through sampling. The Group, however, had neither the time nor the resources to conduct such studies.

In addition the Group suspects that other cost savings would be identified in the course of implementing the proposal. Further, the

Group suspects that the aggregated cost savings, in the least, would offset the cost of increased card filing and would probably exceed it.

X. DURATION

The Group views the proposal as an experiment which would run for twelve months. It would be prospective and deal only with materials received after a specified date and lacking cataloging copy. Current backlogs would remain intact, searched and reduced according to present practice. Once the results of the experiment are known, the question of what to do with these backlogs would be addressed.

During the course of the experiment, important data would need to be collected. Principal sources of this data would be a duplicate shelf list card, which would indicate those items receiving BRC, and FRN notices, which would indicate those items for which full cataloging copy was subsequently available. Additional data, including the degree of usefulness of card catalog access points, would be collected at the determination of an Implementation and/or Evaluation Group.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

Using a blend of Full Original Cataloging and Brief Record Cataloging the University of Michigan Library could catalog 10,000-12,000 monograph titles annually for which there is no RLIN copy. The proposed system is flexible and can expand or contract according to need. It is based on the Original Monograph Cataloging staff currently budgeted but would produce a more desirable mix of full and brief cataloging if a sixth cataloger position were created. In addition to retaining an original cataloging capacity at the University of Michigan, the proposal recognizes an institutional responsibility to RLG and a commitment to RLG programs. By entering unique titles into RLIN, it promotes resource sharing and cooperative collection development. At the same time, by concentrating some of the full original cataloging capacity in selected subjects, it provides leadership among RLG member libraries in the area of shared cataloging.

Thus, the proposed system is expected to have numerous benefits. The chief one, though, is improved user access to a body of material which presently is accessible only through mediated staff effort. It is virtually impossible to measure the effects which improved access can have on scholarship. Belief that there is a correlation has been a fundamental precept of the Group and a driving force behind the design of the proposed system.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Alice. "Minimal level cataloging for books at the University of Michigan: Background Paper." Unpublished, dated June 14, 1982, 4 p.

Avram, Henriette D. "Authority control and its place." In Journal of Academic Librarianship, vol. 9, no. 6, Jan. 1984.

Beckman, Margaret M. "Online catalogs and library users." In Library Journal, Nov. 1, 1982.

Bednar, Colleen. "Library exchange: minimal level cataloging." In RTSD Newsletter, vol. 8, no. 2, March/April 1983.

Columbia University, Library. Task Force on Minimal Level Cataloging. "Report." Oct. 1, 1982, 16 p.

Glazier, Ed. "RLG Base Level Standard--Books." Memo dated July 31, 1983 with RLG Doc 83-71, 4 p.

"Project launched to reduce large cataloging arrearage." In Library of Congress Information Bulletin, Aug. 8, 1983, p. 254-256.

Seal, Alan, et al. Full and short entry catalogues: library needs and uses. Aldershot, Gower, 1982.

University of California, Berkeley. Committee on Bibliographic Control. "Proposal for brief cataloging--monographs." Memo, August 5, 1982, 7 p.

University of California, Los Angeles. Library Technical Service Information Bulletin. "Minimal level cataloging." n.d.

FINAL REPORT
WHAT OTHER LIBRARIES ARE DOING

The University of Michigan Library is certainly not alone in facing the problems of insufficient numbers of catalogers, inadequate quantities of cataloging copy and the resultant backlogs. It is a concern in most large libraries today. In the committee's search for answers to the many questions about how best to eliminate or control these problems, it has gained insight from documents, articles, and responses to queries which outline how a number of other libraries are coping with similar situations. The focus of these can be divided into two general categories--processing priorities for newly received materials and scope of minimal level cataloging.

Processing Priorities

One major aspect of processing priorities the committee examined is pre-cataloging searching intervals. Because of the heavy reliance upon cataloging copy available through the major utilities and the reduction in quantity of LC copy available, strategies for scheduling pre-cataloging searching of RLIN or OCLC have become important to improved efficiency. To increase efficiency and optimize hit rates, pre-cataloging searching must be scheduled so that titles are searched only at times when copy is most likely to be found. Through a query of other RLIN libraries the committee discovered a range of intervals for holding materials for which copy was not originally found. Of the twelve libraries responding, three had no established holding interval, two attempted (unsuccessfully in recent months) to search items monthly, and the rest held items from three to eighteen months before researching. Most libraries attempted to research materials at least every three to six months. Berkeley, the library with the second longest holding period of twelve months, provides temporary access to their backlogged materials through main entry, title, series and keywords in title.

Several libraries also assigned priority levels to type of materials being searched. For example, Brown divided materials by date of imprint. Materials with the current two years' imprint were held for three months and scheduled to be searched every month before being forwarded to cataloging. Older imprints were forwarded to cataloging immediately if no copy was found upon receipt of the item. Other libraries divided materials by language, way in which material was received, or availability of LC card number to determine how frequently searches should be performed.

The committee also reviewed several articles describing pre-cataloging searching in OCLC. One study at the University of Louisville revealed that waiting one to four weeks to perform a first search and twelve weeks for a second search produced optimal results. A second study conducted at Virginia Tech concluded that the first four weeks were most likely to produce records in the OCLC data base and after that researching should be done at eight to twelve week intervals. The study also found that 73.8% of the American imprints received had either full LC copy or CIP copy available immediately. This was true for only 16.8% of the British titles and 12.1% of others. In addition the Virginia Tech study found that accepting

CIP copy may cause subsequent problems since two-thirds of these records will eventually be changed and approximately one-quarter of CIP records will have "significant" changes made in them. Whether or not to accept CIP copy and member copy in both OCLC and RLIN remains a question. The committee found no consistency in policies among the libraries for which this information was known.

Scope of Minimal Level Cataloging

Which materials receive minimal level cataloging and exactly what MLC records contain are perhaps the most weighty questions the committee has faced. Standards for MLC records have been established at the national level with the National Level Bibliographic Record-Books-Minimal Level Cataloging Mandatory Data Elements. RLG has proposed an MLC standard which builds upon the NLBR MLC with added system requirements needed to run the RLIN system and elements needed for the preservation microfilming project. Library of Congress already has used its version of an MLC record to catalog in excess of 20,000 titles and anticipates continuing to use MLC for 5% of their cataloging in the future.

In addition several other libraries have developed their own versions of an MLC record. Columbia proposed using an MLC standard which is fuller than the RLG standard by the addition of a subject or added entry and includes full classification. Time savings of 30% over full cataloging is projected despite these augmentations. Berkeley follows the NLBC with the addition of an extra access point (in what is called a brief cataloging record) in an attempt to incorporate some of its 200,000 title backlog into the cataloged collection. Berkeley and the University of Toronto both project that they will perform 10% of their cataloging at minimal level. While Stanford plans to do 30% of their cataloging at minimal level.

At ALA's Midwinter Meeting of the Technical Services Directors of Large Research Libraries Discussion Group all the libraries which reported current use of MLC agreed that these records were to be permament and would not be upgraded. And although LC does not classify their minimal level titles, most other libraries concurred that classifying these materials should be part of their processing. One exception to this is UCLA, where a shelving arrangement has been devised by using major language groups and five character alpha-numeric codes.

Also at issue in the MLC debate is the level of authority control that should be maintained. Consideration is being given to a total rethinking of current authority control systems. Although LC checks its online files, if a heading is not found, it will establish one in accordance with AACR2 but will not create a name authority record. Berkeley plans similar authority work, checking local records and when no match is found creating AACR2 compatible forms for names, but using only the information available from the book.

And of course another major issue involved in minimal level cataloging is the selection of materials to receive this treatment.

At a number of libraries potential usage of the item is the determining factor. Language of publication appeared a major predictor of usage at UCLA. Berkeley devised a list of categories including language, government documents with corporate entries or titles that could provide adequate keyword access, belles lettres, analytics, and items chosen by selectors. At Columbia it was determined that specific categories of materials to receive MLC should be drawn up rather than having selectors choose items on a title-by-title basis. However, selectors could designate additional items to receive MLC or pull items out of MLC categories if they felt full cataloging was important.

Obviously there are numerous questions to be resolved in establishing minimal level cataloging. One final point which libraries have still not adequately resolved is whether or not these records will be available through major utilities or will be for local use only. LC will distribute their minimal records: UCLA records are available only locally. RLG's decisions about cost and flexibility of their ~~MLC~~ records will no doubt weigh heavily in other libraries' determinations of whether or not to share these records.

base level

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

To: Minimal Level Cataloging Committee
From: Peggy Daub pd
Date: 4 May 1983.
Re: attached chart

In the attached chart I have tried to pull together all we know about national cataloging standards, RLIN and GEAC system requirements (or, in the case of GEAC, capabilities), proposals we have studied, or short-record cataloging already in use elsewhere. I started with Ed Glazier document of 30 March 1982, and first removed all the elements which are supplied by the system. Then I took what was left and added to it everything I could tell about five other systems: Alice Allen's proposal for minimal level cataloging here, the British proposal we looked at in our last meeting, GEAC's capabilities, and short-record cataloging currently being done at Columbia and Berkeley.

There are a few other short-record cataloging systems currently in use which I didn't know enough about to add to the chart. Here is what seems to be known about each:

Library of Congress: presumably following NLBR; no added entries or subject entries; does authority work; no classification.

University of Illinois: One name access point, either the main entry or an added entry

UCLA: complete descriptive cataloging (i.e., many things in addition to what's on the chart); no subject headings (or added entries?); no classification unless part of a series already classified; access is through author, key words in the title, and series

MINIMAL LEVEL CATALOGING FOR BOOKS

STANDARDS, REQUIREMENTS, AND PROPOSALS

DRAFT: May 1983

URCES OF MLC :QUIREMENTS:	NLBR MLC	AACR2 Level 1	RLIN System	Pres. Micro.	PROPOSED RLG MLC—BOOKS	Allen	British proposal	Columbia	GEAC	Berkeley
AG and Field Name										
EADER										
5-07 (BLT) Bibl. type & level	X		X		X			X		
8 (DCF) Desc.cat.form	X		X		X	X		X		
ONTROL FIELDS										
007										
1 Generat. of micro.				X	X			X		
3 Polarity				X						
008										
(PC) Date Type			X		X	X		X		
7-14 (PD) Dates			X		X	X		X		X
5-17 (CP) Country			X		X	X		X		X
5-37 (L) Language	X		X		X	X		X		X
9 (CSC) Cat. Source	X				X			X		
C Cataloging category			X		X	X		X		
ARIABLE FIELDS										
010 LC Card No.	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X
020 ISBN	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
040 Cataloging Source $a, $b, $c	X				X	X				
xx Main Entry	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
240 Uniform Title							X	X		

BACKGROUND DOCUMENT 2 (p.3)

	NLBR MLC	AACR2 Level 1	RLIN System	Pres. Micro.	PROPOSED RLG MLC—BOOKS	Allen	British proposal	Columbia	GEAC	Berkeley
245 Title (incl. a.e.)										
$a Title proper	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
$b Other title info.			X		X	X	X	X		X
$c Sta. of respons.	X	X			X	X	X	X		X
$n No. of section	X				X	X	X			
$p Name of section	X				X	X	X			
250 Edition statement	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		
260 Publisher, etc.										
$a Place of pub.			X		X	X		X		X
$b Publisher	X	X	X		X	X		X		X
$c Date	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
300 $a Extent of item	X	X	X		X	X		X		X
440,490 Series (incl.a.e.)	X				X	X		X		X
503 Bibl. history note							X			
533 Photoreprod. note	X			X	X			X		
6xx/7xx Subject or other added entry								X		
61X Proper noun subj.							X			
71x Proper noun a.e.							X			X
8xx Series tracings						X		X		
Classification						X		X	X	X
Holdings			X		X	?		?	X	?

Northwestern University

SUBJECT HEADING POLICY

Catalog Department Memorandum
82-22 (var)
June 25, 1982

SUBJECT: Use of Library of Congress Subject Headings by catalogers

1. The latest edition of the Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH), its supplements, and the LCSH microfiche make up the thesaurus used for assigning subject headings to works handled in the NUL Catalog Department.

2. ORIGINAL CATALOGING: Works which receive original cataloging are assigned subject headings as appropriate from LCSH.

3. COPY CATALOGING: Copy catalogers generally do not assign subject headings to works handled, but rather accept headings which appear on cataloging copy. However:

A. Older copy: Because of the rate at which LC subject headings are revised, many subject headings on older cataloging copy are obsolete. Subject headings on pre-1970 copy, therefore, are checked against LCSH. If a heading is no longer valid, the new heading is determined and used. Problems are referred to the supervisor.

B. "Stop List": Certain headings and types of headings have been identified which are routinely altered if found on LC copy. The "Stop list" of such headings is contained in CMD82-23.

Note that items 2 and 3 refer to types of cataloging, not to types of catalogers. Original catalogers performing copy cataloging generally follow the guidelines included in item 3.

4. RECATALOGING: In recataloging, the entire record is examined. Subject headings are therefore checked against LCSH as if the cataloging were new.

5. CONVERSIONS: Subject headings on records being converted by non-catalogers are transcribed as is, except that the "stop list" is consulted for possible changes. (see 3B above, and CDM82-23)

6. ADDED COPIES AND VOLUMES, TRANSFERS, WITHDRAWALS: Subject headings on NOTIS copy are generally not checked. Subject headings on older cataloging being converted are checked according to 5 above.

7. Catalog Maintenance: Subject heading practice and application changes continually at the Library of Congress. It is Catalog Department policy to maintain the NOTIS subject index to reflect current LC practice. The subject card catalog was closed in June, 1982. Cards reflecting new or revised heading use are not filed into this catalog, although existing cards may be removed if the subject headings they contain have been revised on NOTIS.

8. Identification of new subject headings, subject authority work,etc.: Until June 17, 1982, original catalogers prepared manual authority records as appropriate for subject headings assigned to works given original cataloging. From that date, no subject authority records are being created, pending development of standards and requirements for NOTIS subject authority records.

Subject headings new to the NOTIS bibliographic file are identified from a machine-generated list produced monthly. Final procedures for heading verification, etc. using this list are still under development.

9. Subject heading problems: Original catalogers and Catalog Management are the chief originators of subject authority work. Copy Cataloging Unit subject problems may be referred to Catalog Management with the concurrence of the Copy Cataloging supervisor. Conflicts in subject headings, online or manual, may be referred to Catalog Management for resolution.

SUPERSEDES: CDM76-1

ORIGINALLY NUMBERED: CDM80-7 (never issued)

RELATED MEMOS: CDM79-2 (Acceptance of LC copy); CDM76-3 (Subject Authority File); CDM82-23 (Appendix to 82-22)

ADDITIONAL FILING TERMS: LCSH; Library of Congress Subject Headings; Subject headings; Subject Authority Work

Northwestern University

SUBJECT HEADING POLICY
APPENDIX

Catalog Department Memorandum
82-23 (VHG)
June 25, 1982

SUBJECT: LCSH subject heading changes; categories of changes for use when reviewing LC copy.

This list is not exhaustive. It is meant as a memory aid to prompt further verification of current use.

(CSB= Cataloging Service Bulletin)

NEOLOGISMS: major heading changes because of obsolete terminology. The following list can be considered complete for routine substitution on LC copy.

Old heading	New heading
Aeroplanes	Airplanes
European War, 1914-1918	World War, 1914-1918
Insurance, Social	Social Security
Mohammedanism	Islam
Mohammedans	Muslims
Negroes	Afro-Americans
Negro...	Afro-American...
	..., Afro-American
	Blacks
	Black...
	..., Black
Woman	Women

GEOGRAPHIC NAME CHANGES (includes use as subdivision) The following list can be considered complete for routine substitution on LC copy.

Old heading	New Heading
Argentine Republic	Argentina
Germany (Democratic Republic, 1949-)	Germany (East)
Germany, East	
Germany (Federal Republic, 1949-)	Germany (West)
Germany, West	
Rhodesia	Zimbabwe
Russia (1923- U.S.S.R.)	Soviet Union (CSB n.s. no.12)
Russia <as topical subj>	
Africa, South	South Africa

SUBDIVISONS (LOCAL): indirect vs. direct (CSB 120 & 121 & refer to "A Guide to subdivision practice," p.2) The following list is illustrative only.

Old heading	New heading
Education--Chicago, Ill.	Education--Illinois--Chicago
Music--Zurich	Music--Switzerland--Zurich

Four cities are exceptions and can be used directly: Washington (D.C.), New York (N.Y.), Berlin, Jerusalem

SUBDIVISIONS (OBSOLETE) The following list can be considered complete for routine substitution on LC copy.

Old subdivision	New subdivision
--Collections	--Collected works (with 6 exceptions see CSB 107)
--Politics	--Politics and government
--Relations (general) with	--Relations--<Indirect>
--Relations (military) with	--Military relations--<Indirect> (CSB n.s. no.14)

CHRONOLOGICAL PERIODS (CSB 108) The following list is illustrative only.

Old heading	New heading
United States--History--Civil War	United States--History--Civil War, 1861-1865
France--Politics and government--Revolution	France--Politics and government--Revolution, 1789-1799
English poetry--Early modern (to 1700)	English poetry--Early modern, 1500-1700

ABBREVIATIONS (current practice is to spell out almost everything). The following list is illustrative only.

Old heading	New heading
U.S.--Hist.	United States--History
Gt. Brit.--Pol. & govt.	Great Britain--Politics and government
Spain--Econ. condit.	Spain--Economic conditions

OTHER TYPES OF CHANGES The following lists are illustrative only.

PLURAL TO SINGULAR (in certain art headings - CSB 121)

Old heading	New heading
Paintings	Painting
Etchings	Etching

<TOPIC> IN <GEOGRAPHIC NAME> PHRASES (CSB n.s. no.12)

Old heading	New heading
Jews in Spain <Brazil, etc.>	Jews--Spain <Brazil, etc.>
Methodist Church in the U.S. <Canada, etc.>	Methodist Church--United States
French language in Canada <Haiti, etc.>	French language--Canada <Haiti, etc.>

CLASSES OF PERSONS OF PARTICULAR NATIONALITIES (CSB 115)

Old heading	New Heading
Explorers, Portuguese <etc.>	Explorers--<Indirect>
Musicians, Austrian <etc.>	Musicians--<Indirect>
Engineers, American <etc.>	Engineers--United States

(Does not include ethnic groups, religion, sex, etc. or literary authors, i.e., Scientists, Muslim; Women scientists; Poets, French, etc. are still valid types of headings)

ADDITIONAL FILING TERMS: Subject Heading Changes; Stop List for Subject Headings;

ORIGINALLY NUMBERED: CDM80-7A (never issued)

RELATED MEMOS: CDM82-22 (Subject Heading Policy)

STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES FOR THE CATALOGING DEPARTMENT

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

Phyllis Carter
Avinash Maheshwary
Janie C. Morris
Pauline L. Nease,
Chairperson

CATALOGING DEPARTMENT

PERKINS LIBRARY

DUKE UNIVERSITY

November 1, 1979

PREFACE

On March 13, 1979 a committee of librarians was appointed to develop performance standards for original cataloging. The accompanying document, "Statement of Professional Responsibilities for the Cataloging Department" was the result. Subsequently the University Librarian authorized implementation of its recommendations in a test phase. The outcome, though not predictable, was instructive.

The Committee had difficulty establishing qualitative norms and the means for monitoring them. At one point they designed a mathematical grid to measure qualitative features, but it proved too elaborate to be workable. While rather ingenius, it would have placed too great a burden upon the Head of the Original Cataloging Section whose work of revision would have been unrealistically extended by a plethora of computations.

In putting the scheme in operation the greater difficulty came from a wholly unanticipated direction, i.e., the catalog librarians themselves. They had been consulted regularly by their peers on the committee and in the early stages of implementation voiced no serious objections to the Statement's provisions. However, after a year or so they began to be vocal over two concerns: first, that they, among professional librarians at Duke, had been singled out for special scrutiny and, second, that in the rigorous application of standards they compared unfavorably with other professional librarians in evaluations for salary improvement, promotion and the like. They made it clear that if there were to be performance standards, they should apply evenly to all professional staff members.

Such standards did not exist for other professional positions. Reference librarians had discussed the possibility, but had put nothing down on paper. The matter came to rest with the University Librarian and his group of assistant university librarians. They concluded that it was not feasible in the short term to draft detailed performance standards for all professional librarians. The experiment involving catalogers was suspended pending further study. Consequently the provisions of the Statement are not in effect at this time.

Even so, the experience of coming to terms with quantitative and qualitative guidelines for original cataloging proved invaluable. It was one of the earliest efforts we know of to put in writing norms of performance, a process which measurably increased our understanding of what we were doing and how well we should be doing it. Finally, the concern emphasized throughout for quality work at a reasonable level of expectation continues to inform the practice of original cataloging. From the outset that was our intention and goal.

Lawrence O. Kline
Head
Monographic Cataloging Department

March 15, 1984

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
DISTRIBUTION OF TIME	3
QUANTIFIABLE GOALS OF EXPECTATION	6
QUALITY STANDARDS	12
TRAINING	16
CONSULTATION	17
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	18
BIBLIOGRAPHY	20
APPENDICES	
Appendix 1: Letter of Appointment of the Committee	24
Appendix 2: Questionnaire to ARL Libraries	26
Summary - Analysis	32
Appendix 3: Questionnaire to Original Catalog Librarians	38
Compilation and analysis	41
Questionnaire to Non-Cataloging Professional Librarians in the Cataloging Department	48
Summary	50

INTRODUCTION

Reorganization and change have been paramount in the Cataloging Department in the last two to three years. Now, with stability becoming more evident in the structure and its operation, it is desirable to effect the greatest advantages from computer-assisted cataloging. The setting of goals can help to accomplish this. In response to a recognized need for productivity and quality standards, and for the enhancement of opportunities for professional growth, the Administration of the Cataloging Department appointed a committee "to develop a statement of professional responsibilities for the Cataloging Department." The Committee has concentrated on the role of the original catalog librarian at Duke, and how the greatest potential of each individual can best be realized by contributing to the overall goals of the Department.

The Committee, composed of Phyllis Carter, Avinash Maheshwary, Janie C. Morris, and Pauline L. Nease, Chairperson, began its work on March 13, 1979. The charge specifically required the Committee to make policy recommendations in the following areas:

(1) Percentage of time a professional librarian may spend on direct "on-the-job" responsibilities versus special assignments, both within and outside of the Department, and on unassigned activities for professional development;

(2) A quantifiable level of expectation, on a monthly basis;

(3) A scheme for evaluating the quality of professional cataloging and definable margins of error within specified categories; and

(4) Guidelines for training, revision of work, and consultation for catalog librarians.

The charge further stated that the policy statement pertained primarily to the original catalog librarians; however, the recommendations concerning distribution of time on assigned and non-assigned professional activities would apply to all professionals in the Department. The charge to the Committee also stated that "All guidelines which are designed by the Committee must be compatible with all DUL policies, particularly those used in connection with the Committee on Appointment and Promotion and term reappointments. The standards developed will be used as part of any administrative evaluations, as well as for the administrative review for CAP and term reappointments." (For the letter of appointment of the Committee see Appendix 1)

The Committee gathered information and ideas through questionnaires to thirty ARL libraries and received responses from twenty-two of these. For a copy of the questionnaire and summary analysis of the responses see Appendix 2. Further data was collected by the in-house questionnaires (Appendix 3). Summaries of interviews and the Committee's correspondence are available as

supplementary material. Meetings with the original catalog librarians and supervisors were held. A search of Library Literature and ERIC data base through April 1979, listing of dissertations in the Journal Of Education For Librarianship, and annual reports of technical service and/or cataloging departments of comparable institutions was carried out. Part of this material, and any later information found, is given in the bibliography. Unpublished policies and manuals supplied by ARL libraries were read.

The study has generated a great deal of interest in the library community. Almost all the libraries responding to the questionnaire have expressed interest in receiving a copy of the Committee's report. In June, 1979, by invitation, a member of the Committee reported on the progress of the study at the Catalog Norms Discussion Group at the American Library Association Conference in Dallas. A tape recording of this discussion will be made available in the Duke University Library Archives. An invitation has also been received to participate in the Group's discussion in 1980.

The arrangement of the sections of the report correspond, in general, to the four parts of the charge as outlined above.

I. DISTRIBUTION OF TIME

In the Cataloging Department, where professionals with many varied talents are charged with varied assignments, it is extremely difficult to sharply delineate the areas of their activities. For purposes of this study, the following groupings are the most practical:

(1) Assigned activities -- those outlined in the job description, or required by the administration from time to time:

(a) monographic cataloging;

(b) cataloging-related activities, e.g., revising filing in the public catalogs;

(c) special assignments, e.g., the assistance given by original catalog librarians in three major catalog maintenance projects last year;

(d) appointments to departmental committees and/or individual work assignments, e.g., a recent committee investigation of the handling of sets; and

(e) appointments to non-departmental committees and/or individual assignments, e.g., official representation of the Library on University and/or professional bodies.

(2) Non-assigned activities -- generally directed towards professional growth of the individual librarian. These are usually activities of his/her own choosing. Included in this category are professional workshops, conferences, seminars; and teaching, formal coursework, research, writing.

There are twelve members (eleven f.t.e.) of the Original Cataloging Section, including the South Asian Librarian and the Ibero-American Librarian. A study of the in-house questionnaire to original catalogers, June 11, 1979, showed that the schedules of the nine full-time catalog librarians included numerous responsibilities other than monographic cataloging.[1] The cataloging-related activities which at present involve two or more people require a varying amount of time; some tasks require little time while others are time consuming. These tasks include: revision of filing in the public catalogs

---

[1]See Appendix 3. At the time the questionnaire was distributed there was one vacancy (Music-German), which was filled September 4, and one librarian scheduled to retire in September, 1979. The latter had not cataloged after the OCLC terminals were installed. Her opinions were solicited as part of another questionnaire which may also be seen in Appendix 3.

(7 librarians), revising cataloging (5), training in the Department, e.g., in revision of filing, (5), helping bibliographic searchers (2). Three catalog librarians catalog but do not tag, serial titles in Hebrew, Oriental, and some Slavic languages. Assignments to particular individuals include marking Russian titles for the Bindery; choosing appropriate library destinations for documents, press books and selected class separate serials of a scientific nature; assisting Acquisitions in establishing correct main entries for Hebrew items; and the romanization and searching of oriental titles selected for ordering. In June, 1979, searching Cyrillic alphabet books for LC/OCLC copy was requiring approximately twenty-five percent of the work schedule of one catalog librarian; this assignment has since been absorbed by the Pre-Cataloging Unit. Two of the full-time librarians do translation as needed for patrons and/or staff; and indicated they occasionally give direct assistance to patrons.

The Ibero-American Librarian is working with the cooperative acquisitions program among Duke, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and North Carolina State; is routinely concerned with collection development and analysis; and is expected to devote at least half-time to monographic cataloging. The South Asian Librarian has the responsibility for the total administration of the South Asian PL480 Office, including the processing of PL480 materials, training and supervising his student staff members, liaison work with the Library of Congress, and book collection development. Both librarians share interdepartmental liaison work, and give direct assistance to patrons through translation and/or reference work as needed.

All catalog librarians must necessarily keep up-to-date by reading new information in LC and OCLC references which are used as cataloging tools, supervisory memos, minutes of administrative and advisory groups and the professional journals, and by attending training sessions and required departmental meetings. There is at times participation in special projects. Five catalog librarians are actively serving on departmental and non-departmental committees. Two are holding offices in the Librarians Assembly.

Based on answers to the questionnaire sent to the catalog librarians, time distributions were calculated to be, on the average: fifty percent, monographic cataloging; forty-five percent, job-related and special assignments, and five percent, non-assigned activities devoted to professional growth. Appendix 3 contains a listing of all the varied activities of the Section.

RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that a full-time catalog librarian should spend on the average at least sixty-five percent of his/her schedule for monographic cataloging and twenty percent for other job-related assignments.

Duke librarians have taken active roles in local, national, and international professional organizations. It is desirable for this leadership and participation to continue. All of the ARL libraries who responded to the Committee's questionnaire were fair in allowing time for professional activities (See Appendix 2, question III B), p. 9.) No library denied any legitimate request. Reason dictates a balance between on-the-job responsibilities and professional growth activities. At Duke, research and writing, except as

integral parts of committee work, have not occupied large portions of staff time. For those who would engage in such activities, an allowance of time would be a tremendous advantage, especially in the absence of sabbatical leaves.[2]

RECOMMENDATION: Considering the mutual benefits to both the Library and the individual, the Committee recommends that up to fifteen percent of work time per year be granted to each professional librarian in the Cataloging Department for professional growth activities. It is understood that given special circumstances (or in special instances), the percentage will vary from one individual to another. Each professional catalog librarian should spend at least five percent of the work schedule in this manner.

The Committee recommends these percentages be roughly halved in projecting schedules for half-time librarians. Special arrangements should be worked out with the Head of Cataloging for the cataloging schedule of the South Asian Librarian because of the scope of his assignments and his special involvement in public service activities.

---

[2]For a recent discussion of professional leave for research activities see Tillie Krieger, "Calling a Bull 'Cow" Won't Get You Milk, or Is Too Much of a Good Thing, Good?" Journal of Academic Librarianship, 4 (July 1978) : 130-31.

II. QUANTIFIABLE LEVELS OF EXPECTATION

The establishment of a quantifiable range of expectation can (1) serve as a useful tool for management planning; (2) give present and prospective staff a concrete guideline for one job expectation; (3) provide one element for objective judgment in the evaluation of a catalog librarian's work performance; and (4) assist individuals in setting goals for achievement and improvement.

With this in mind, the Committee reviewed information from sources described in the introduction to see now it could be used to set a meaningful and realistic quantifiable cataloging goal for original cataloging. Consistency in the information was lacking, and there was no indication of any established model or developing pattern among libraries for setting quantifiable goals. The data accumulated could not therefore, be used for setting ranges at Duke. The findings are of interest, however, because they relate attitudes and activities in the library community with regard to quantitative standards.

Literature search. Published literature in this area is scarce and very general in nature. Two relevant articles are Eleanor Payne's "Cataloging Productivity Quotas,"[3] and "Statistical Measurement and Cataloging: Variables Determining Quantitative Output" by Dulce Didio McLean.[4] However, neither of the articles offers practical guidelines. In Payne's paper, which was presented at the annual conference of the American Library Association, Resources and Technical Services Division, Cataloging Norms Discussion Group, June 20, 1977, she states why she is opposed to setting cataloging quotas. She does not precisely define the term "quota" but uses it in general to mean "numerical measurement of productivity." McLean discusses the subject in theoretical terms.

ARL library responses to questionnaires and telephone interviews. Of twenty-two ARL libraries only six indicated some sort of quantifiable level of productivity: Northwestern, University of California at Los Angeles, University of Chicago, University of Washington at Seattle, University of Wisconsin at Madison, and Yale University. Only the University of Washington at Seattle indicated that it set a quantifiable range--40 to 160 titles a month. The Head of the Catalog Department indicated in the questionnaire that the figure for each catalog librarian depended on the librarian's other duties, past experience, and the difficulty of assigned material. The cataloging done by original catalog librarians at the University of Washington includes sixty percent member copy.

---

[3] Eleanor Payne, Cataloging Productivity Quotas. ERIC ED 150 965.

[4] Dulce Didio McLean, Statistical Measurement and Cataloging: Variables Determining Quantitative Output. ERIC ED 144 606.

The Committee tried to contact these six libraries by phone for more specific information, and succeeded in reaching Yale, Wisconsin, and Northwestern. Yale had stated in the questionnaire that it set an individual goal of one hundred titles per month. In the phone interview the Head of the Cataloging Department said that the figure of one hundred is loosely interpreted. She said that some catalog librarians would never be expected to reach this figure because of the material they cataloged, and that no catalog librarian is expected to meet this figure every month. According to her, about twenty-five percent of the librarians in the unit reach this goal. Sixty-nine percent of what the original catalog libraians cataloged included member copy.

The Head of the Catalog Department at Northwestern said in the phone interview that the eight catalog librarians averaged as a group between 200 and 250 titles a month (or about twenty-five titles per person per month). Original cataloging with few exceptions has "no copy."

In the questionnaire, Wisconsin responded that the catalog librarians establish individual goals in consultation with the Head of the Department. They try to spend at least half of their work hours on cataloging to produce at least one piece of cataloging per hour. In the phone interview, the Head of the Catalog Department said that catalog librarians spend about sixty-six percent of their time cataloging. Further, she said that at the outset the prospective catalog librarian is told that he/she would be expected to produce at least one title per cataloging hour. However, according to her, not more than fifty percent are able to reach this goal at the present time. She attributed lack of experience as the main reason for the librarians who fail to meet this goal. In her opinion, it takes about three years' experience for a catalog librarian to be able to average a piece an hour. She also thinks that librarians who regularly catalog in specific areas more easily meet their goals than those cataloging in a variety of areas. Original catalog librarians at Wisconsin use eighty percent LC or member copy; only twenty percent of their cataloging consists of "no copy."

The remaining libraries, which specified no departmental or individual productivity goals, adopt several monitoring methods. For a detailed breakdown of these methods see the summary/analysis of the questionnaire in Appendix 2.

Summary of findings. In all the data collected through questionnaires, literature, and interviews, opinions vary from a recognized need by management for some control of cataloging production to subjective observations that production accountability is demoralizing to the individual, even though there is no empirical evidence to substantiate this latter assertion. One administrator expressed a strong distaste for quantifiable levels, surmising that the paper work involved with trying to implement such a policy would in itself be counter-productive. At Duke, however, no more statistics would be required than are presently recorded for individual catalog librarians. Other administrators expressed, however, a need for some form of management control over the work and production of original catalog librarians, but they were unable to offer any specific suggestions.

One of the people interviewed said that in her experience at the Library of Congress, the better she became as a cataloger, the more difficult material

she was given to catalog. While in fact she was gaining experience and expertise, her statistics did not increase.

Georgia State, (not one of the ARL libraries surveyed) has set a minimum standard of productivity for original catalog librarians. By the end of the first three months of employment, a catalog librarian is expected to catalog at the rate of .77 monographic titles per month.[5] The percentage of the material cataloged by professional catalog librarians with some type of copy is unknown.

Committee approach to setting the ranges. Without a model, the most plausible approach left to the Committee was (1) to study the present capabilities of the staff; (2) to identify the factors and/or variables that seemed to be effecting greater time consumption in cataloging; (3) to weigh the possible impact of future developments such as the introduction of Dewey 19, AACRII, improved OCLC capabilities, changes in local work procedures; and (4) to assess the advantages of more cataloging experience in time as librarians further develop their skills "by doing."

Responses from Perkins Original Catalog Librarians

The amount of actual catalog time available, the difficulty of material assigned, factors affecting productivity, projecting quantifiable ranges, and suggestions for improvement in these areas were discussed with the staff at several meetings.

Among the factors which seemed to be affecting productivity many have now been dealt with by the Cataloging Administration:

(1) Difficulty of adjusting to the new work area--Traffic and noise levels increased in the area where most catalog librarians were relocated partly because of the proximity to the terminal room, and partly because the area constitutes "an island" about which other staff members must walk to carry out their own assignments. In September some changes were made to group all the original catalog librarians in this same area, and in the process a greater degree of protection from traffic aisles has resulted.

(2) Difficulty of materials--Much of the material remaining for original cataloging is more difficult and presents unique cataloging problems. Original catalog librarians expect to do this type of material and feel that it is really what they should be doing. However, some of this material may, by its nature, prove to be time consuming.

(3) Lack of Pre-Cataloging assistance in searching for main and added entries. This situation is presently being addressed; the Unit is fully staffed and training is in process to begin to provide this type of assistance; it is hoped before the end of 1979.

---

[5]Georgia State University Library. "Requirements for Professionals," 1975. (Photocopy)

(4) Unavailability of supervisors for consultation when needed--The demands on the time of the Assistant Head of the Department and the Principal Cataloger have limited access to them for this type of direct consultation. It is anticipated that the newly created position of Head of the Original Cataloging Section will resolve this problem.

(5) Loss of catalog librarians from the unit with subject and/or language expertise--The responsibility for processing material in those areas was relegated to librarians with other specialties, which of necessity took more time. A new cataloging position (Music-German) was created in April, 1976, and filled September 4.

(6) Distribution system--Until recently, catalog librarians were expected to catalog in any subject and/or language areas, not necessarily those within their primary areas of expertise. In addition, the original cataloging material located in the backlog area was grouped together (with few exceptions) regardless of language or subject. Selecting material from these shelves was time consuming.

A new shelf arrangement by language has been begun, and Rush and Priority items are distributed as nearly as possible according to language/subject specialties.

(7) Effects of many changes connected with the introduction of network cataloging--Tagging involves an additional step in cataloging, but in time, more experience will help reduce the amount of time needed for it.

(8) Lack of certain types of reference materials, especially for work with Hebrew and South Asian PL480 materials. Some very specialized references are located in branch libraries and are too costly to be duplicated for the general reference collection. Catalog librarians are requested to make recommendations to the Head of the Cataloging Department for possible new titles to the Official Reference Collection.

(9) Committment to non-cataloging activities.

The catalog librarians were sharply divided on the question of setting quantifiable ranges. Three declined to suggest a range; one proposed a daily quota; and the others suggested ranges which varied quite widely.

On the basis of information gathered, the Committee found itself unable to draw a uniform conclusion. The Cataloging statistics for the Section for 1978/1979 were examined, recognizing that with the subject authority project, OCLC training, etc. during that time, no definite conclusions could be reached. Using these statistics (3,589 titles) and the average of fifty percent available cataloging time per catalog librarian, a rough approximation of the cataloging rate per item averaged 2.5 hours, or twenty-six titles per month per catalog librarian.[6] The Committee acknowledges that not all material will require the same amount of time.

---

[6]For a detailed chart of these calculations refer to Table 1, p.

One of the most obvious ways of increasing cataloging productivity is to increase the amount of actual cataloging time. The recommendation of sixty-five percent available cataloging time is a fifteen percent increase over last year's fifty percent average. It is also logical to assume that advantages afforded by internal changes to remove and/or minimize the deterrents to productivity listed above should be positive factors contributing to improvement over last year.

RECOMMENDATION: The Committee therefore recommends a range of forty-five to one hundred titles per month, based on an average of sixty-five percent cataloging time, as an acceptable goal for original cataloging. This percentage represents approximately 88 hours per month and a range of cataloging rates from slightly under two hours to .87 hours per item.

TABLE 1

CALCULATIONS USED IN DETERMINING APPROXIMATE AVERAGE CATALOGING RATE

(1)	Weekdays in a typical fiscal year by actual count of 1978/79	260 days
(2)	Holidays (12), personal leave (20), break time (13.5), sick leave (10 of allowable total), allowance for 7.5 hours work day on Fridays (3)	58.5 days
(3)	Work days (line [1] less line [2])	201.5 days or 1,612 hours
(4)	Each catalog librarian's estimate of his/her cataloging time in hours, e.g. 70% x 1,612, 25% x 1,612, etc. totaled for all eleven catalog librarians	9,009 hours
(5)	Total output of original cataloging in 1978/79	3,589 items
(6)	Cataloging rate for the Department (line [4] divided by line [5]	2.5 hours per item

III. QUALITY STANDARDS

The success of any method for evaluating quality is contingent upon setting the criteria. In response to the in-house questionnaire, the catalog librarians generally expressed satisfaction with the quality of their work. On factors which enter into quality, everyone included knowing and correctly applying basic rules. All supervisors questioned see command of the accepted rules and practices as basic to quality cataloging. Most of the ARL libraries surveyed agree with these principles. In other words, the catalog librarians fulfill the responsibility to meet user need by providing bibliographic records based on standard procedures and, through them, access to materials. The users may be themselves, patrons, or other librarians carrying out their respective responsibilities.

In attempting to find some relationship between the quality control features of the Solinet error rate and the charge "to design a scheme for evaluating the quality of professional cataloging," the committee contacted Richard Greene, Supervisor in Bibliographic Record Management at OCLC, Inc. He responded with a resumé of the error rate system and added,

> IQCC [Inter-Network Quality Control Committee] is reviewing the above procedure for modification. We are very well aware that the "error rate" is not a real measure of the quality of bibliographic records in the On-Line Union Catalog.

It was anticipated that the work of the Solinet Data Base Quality Control Committee on weighting major and minor errors would be helpful. However, Doris Anne Bradley, chairperson of DBQCC, writes in her letter dated August 9,

> Tallying the error reports and weighing them against total input of a library proved to be unwieldy and, we concluded, unfair, for various reasons. This activity has been suspended. The Inter-Network Quality Control Committee is presently working on a draft for the enforcement of standards in the OCLC system wherein certain errors are considered more serious than others (weighted), and enough of these reported against a library could lead to monitoring of all input by OCLC or eventually some more drastic measure.

To arrive at a means of quality evaluation which is acceptable to all, the catalog librarians were asked what type of revision they think is appropriate as a measure of quality control. They feel keenly the responsibility for high quality, whatever their preferences with regard to revision. Because of the amount of time and expense involved in complete revision, some form of spot revision, as a measure of quality control, is expected by the group. The supervisors questioned favor spot revision--one of them, because full revision is no longer feasible; and they all recommend keeping individual statistical records.

The Committee asked the following questions of ARL libraries: (1) "How do you determine the quality of cataloging performed by individual professional catalogers?" (2) "How do you assess quality cataloging if you do not keep statistics on an individual basis?" (3) "What specific qualitative goals do you set for professional catalogers?"

Six of the twenty-two libraries keep a statistical record on the basis of errors--four of these as a check on substandard work. One library puts no emphasis on quality in evaluation. In two libraries, which do not keep records, full competency is assumed. Whether the libraries do or do not keep individual statistical records, supervisory evaluation relies on spot checks, negative feedback, impressions, and past experience for evaluation, rather than on in-depth revision across the board. To the question as to whether they have qualitative goals, one library replied, "not specified--so far"; another, "eventual independence of review and instruction." The others present no specific goals for the encouragement and measurement of individual achievement.

The Library of Congress, according to the Committee's current information, employs objective quality review procedures as part of the total evaluation of catalog librarians. In the Subject Cataloging Division and in the Descriptive Cataloging Division, where the procedures are in the testing stage, quality review, based on sampling techniques is mandatory for those desiring promotion to positions of responsibility as they are defined within LC's organizational framework. In the Subject Cataloging Division, according to guidelines dated April 28, 1975, and revised April 28, 1976, quality is judged satisfactory or unsatisfactory on the basis of correctly supplying appropriate access. It is assumed that all appointees are capable of reaching the GS-12 level. For promotion to this level, 4.4 percent is the maximum of unsatisfactory sample titles allowed. (Other requirements apply for catalogers of children's literature.)[7] In the Descriptive Cataloging Division, where quality review procedures are being tested for validity, errors in access points are weighted by a factor of three; all other errors, by a factor of one.[8] The allowable error rate at any level is unknown to the Committee.

Although neither the situation nor the objectives to be gained in the evaluation of quality at LC are completely analogous to Duke University Library's organizational structure and goals, the Committee has borrowed from their procedures in the Descriptive Department for formulating a system to evaluate the quality of original cataloging.

The Committee recommends the Quality Evaluation Sampling System, hereafter referred to as Qess. The essential elements of the system are.

---

[7]United States, Library of Congress, Subject Cataloging Division, "Promotion Plan Guidelines and Standards for Subject Catalogers, April, 1975, p.7. (Photocopy)

[8]United States, Library of Congress, Descriptive Cataloging Division, "Descriptive Cataloging Manual," rev. April 1979, sec. A13.5. (Photocopy)

(1) Determination of the quality of work will be based on a systematic sampling of each individual's work rather than on routine revision of all items cataloged. Based on this sample, the reviser may determine if any individuals would need to send more than the minimum number of items for revision, and whether additional training is indicated. Qess determines the number and method of selection of items in the sample.

(2) Corrections necessary to the cataloging record would be characterized as significant and less significant. This allows for a weighing of errors and establishment of primacy of certain areas and subfields in a cataloging record.

(3) An allowable error margin is established (five percent) within which a cataloging record is considered acceptable.

(4) The by-product of Qess is to move from a concept of revision for total quality review to a concept of revision for staff evaluation and maintenance of quality within a certain level of tolerance. The underlying assumption of Qess is the expectation that librarians should be responsible for their own quality, and that their judgments will be consistently sound.

The system requires in-depth revision of a minimum of fifty titles of original monograph cataloging ("no copy") for each person in the group to be evaluated. The revision of the sample should be performed systematically as a daily routine throughout the year. The revisers should select for revision as even a sampling as possible of difficult materials, both book and non-book. Undue bunching of revision is to be avoided, although individual circumstances may at times require a larger than average concentration of titles. During training periods for new procedures, e.g. application of AACRII, it may be advisable to discontinue sampling and revise everything. This will necessitate doubling up the sample at a later date.

A quality evaluation record with comments concerning good/exceptional work on various items, along with notations of errors, should be kept by the reviser for each catalog librarian in Qess. The format of the record should be designed by the reviser as he/she finds most adaptable. The Committee devoted considerable time and labor to the study of how statistical tallies of errors might be kept. Various forms and study summaries constructed during these deliberations are available in supplementary material.

The problem of categorizing errors as major or minor proved to be quite complex. Viewpoints of revisers showed differences; and it was recognized that categories could shift for the same errors. There was general agreement within the Committee and among revisers, however, that the accuracy of choice and form of access points (e.g. main entry, added entries, uniform title, title, subject headings) are of prime importance.

The Committee believes that Qess has several desirable features. The positive aspects of the work enter in as well as the negative. Routinely carried out,

the catalog librarian should have a fairly accurate, continuing picture of progress. A great deal of dependence must be placed on the reviser for the success of any evaluation procedure. It seems best, therefore; to leave him/her free to tailor-make his/her record-keeping mechanism as necessary.

RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends the acceptance of Qess for a trial period of one year, a five percent margin of error, the development of record-keeping formats by the reviser as he/she determines most appropriate; and a decided emphasis on the accuracy of major access points in cataloging records.

IV. TRAINING

The Committee has reviewed comments from librarians at Duke and elsewhere and has found great variations in the length of training programs either in use and/or suggested. These sources have recognized individual differences among catalog librarians as a key factor in making the determinations. The majority of the ARL libraries favored a training period of up to one year. For an experienced catalog librarian the libraries all lowered the ranges from the above rather generally. On an in-house questionnaire, Duke's original catalog librarians showed similar variations in opinions. Most chose one year for the person directly out of library school and six months for the experienced catalog librarian, new to the system. A sampling of the opinion of several former catalog librarians at Duke, now assigned to other duties, indicated a choice of from six months to two years for the novice.

RECOMMENDATION: The Committee makes the following recommendations concerning training:

(1) For a catalog librarian, employed directly out of library school, or for a catalog librarian with experience in a library field other than cataloging, a training period of from one to two years should be allowed. Earlier release may come at the discretion of the trainer.

(2) For an experienced catalog librarian, newly employed, a training period of six months to a year should be allowed. Release may come earlier at the discretion of the trainer.

(3) During the training period, the work of the catalog librarian should generally be completely revised. Partial release from revision may be made during the training period at the discretion of the reviser.

(4) After the successful completion of the training period, the quality of the catalog librarian's work should be evaluated through Qess. Before a person is released he/she should be made fully aware of his/her strengths and weaknesses.

(5) If a catalog librarian experiences difficulty in his/her work, the supervisor is free to revise as necessary, by spot checking or complete revision, to pin-point the trouble. If some type of remedial training seems necessary, this should be done on a one-to-one basis by the supervisor, or a peer designated by the supervisor.

V. CONSULTATION

The Committee found a very excellent overall approach to revision, training, consultation, and evaluation in a policy statement of Stanford University, dated June 13, 1977. Some of the ideas presented here are adapted from this document.[9]

At the end of the training period, the catalog librarian is considered competent in his/her assigned cataloging areas; however, there are occasions for consultation and/or self-requested revision to solve particularly difficult and/or unique cataloging problems. There may also be procedural questions which may need to be resolved. In these cases, the catalog librarian should consult first with the Head of the Original Cataloging Section, who may either resolve the question, or if need be, refer the librarian to another specified individual such as the Principal Cataloger or other subject specialist. Channeling cataloging questions in this manner should enable the Head of the Section to know the work of individuals better, reduce the amount of time involved in more general consultation with numerous, and at times, inappropriate individuals, and eliminate confusion which could result from conflicting advice. In addition, when the same questions are asked by many catalog librarians, the Head can consequently identify problems and principles which may need to be resolved and/or further explained for the staff in general.

---

[9]Allen B. Veaner, "Revision of Librarians' Cataloging." (Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University. 1977) (Photocopy)

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recognized the magnitude of its task and the complexity of the charge very early in the investigation. It can offer at this point no proven formulas or models. With research and deliberation ended the following recommendations are proposed for an initial period of experimentation for one year in the hope that the Committee's efforts will contribute positively toward further improving cataloging service at Duke:

Distribution of time

(1) Subject to circumstances, a professional catalog librarian in the Catalog Department may, with the consent of the Head of the Department, organize his/her work schedule, on the basis of yearly averages of real time (1,612 hours) in the following manner:

   (a) Primary job assignment: monographic cataloging -- sixty-five percent. Reading of updated work references (e.g. LC Cataloging Service Bulletin) and participation in special Departmental projects (e.g. catalog committee assignments) are included in this percentage.

   (b) Other assigned activities such as revising filing, meetings within or outside the Department, general and/or interdepartmental library committees -- twenty percent.

(2) For all professional librarians in the Cataloging Department, unassigned activities such as professional meetings, conferences, continuing education, teaching, course work, research, writing, etc. -- fifteen percent.

Quantifiable level of expectation from the catalog librarian

(3) A range of forty-five to one hundred items per month should be the goal of each full-time catalog librarian. On the basis of 42.5 percent cataloging time (assuming an allowance of 7.5 percent time for professional growth activities), a range of thirty-one to seventy-one titles, on the average, should be the goal for part-time catalog librarians.

Quality standards

(4) The Quality Evaluation Sampling System (Qess) should be given a year's trial. A total selected work sample (minimum, fifty) should be systematically reviewed throughout the year for each catalog librarian. Based on the total possibilities of error in any one individual's work, a five percent margin of error should be allowed.

Training, revision, and consultation

(5) The formal training period for a professional catalog librarian employed either directly from library school, or with non-cataloging library experience may be a period of one to two years. For an experienced catalog librarian, newly employed, it may be six months to one year. Earlier release may come at the discretion of the trainer.

(6) Complete revision should generally be done for all catalog librarians during the formal training period, with partial release at the discretion of the reviser.

(7) A fully trained professional catalog librarian should be expected to use independent judgment in solving difficult and/or unique cataloging problems. If he/she feels the need for consultation on a problem, the Head of the Section should be consulted. The librarian may request revision of any particular items at any time.

Trial period and evaluation of work performance

(8) In any or all areas of recommended guidelines, a trial period of one year should be allowed to determine any adjustments needed. Supervisors, however, will need to utilize the guidelines during that time in making the yearly evaluation of the catalog librarian's work performance and the experimental nature of this document will be taken into account by those supervisors and administrators.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Association of Research Libraries, Office of University Library Management Studies, and McGill University, Staff Performance Evaluation Program - with Supervisor's Manual. Washington, D. C. : The Office, 1976.

Berkner, Dimity S. "Library Staff Development through Performance Appraisal." College and Research Libraries 40 (July 1979) : 335-44.

Carson, Doris M. "Act of Cataloging." Library Resources and Technical Services 20 (1976) : 149-53.

Chrisman, L. G. "Analysis of the Cataloger's Role within the Academic Library Organization," Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1975.

Dougherty, Richard M. "Editorial : Data Base Pollution." Journal of Academic Librarianship 3 (July 1977) : 127.

Drott, M. Carol. "Random Sampling: a Tool for Library Research." College and Research Libraries 30 (1969) : 119-25.

Fox, July. "OCLC at Washington University Libraries." Seattle, 1975. (Photocopied)

Galloway, R. Dean. "Status or Stasis : Academic Librarians 10 Years Later." American Libraries 10 (June 1979) : 349-52.

Georgia State Univeristy Library. "Requirements for Professionals." Atlanta, 1976. (Photocopied)

Glasby, Dorothy J. "Cataloging Norms Discussion Group [Confernce, 1977, Detroit]" Library of Congress Information Bulletin 36 (July 22, 1977) : 498-9.

--------. "Cataloging and Classification Section Cataloging Norms Discussion Group [Midwinter, 1976, Chicago]" Library of Congress Information Bulletin 37 (March 17, 1976) : 178-9.

Goodell, John Silas. "A Case Study of Catalogers in Three University Libraries Using Work Sampling." Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, School of Library Science, 1971.

Gorman, Michael. "On Doing Away with Technical Services Departments." American Libraries 10 (July/August 1979) : 435-37.

Heinritz, Fred J. "Using the Computer for Library Random Sample Selection." College and Research Libraries 40 (May 1979) : 261-63.

Koel, Åke I. "Cataloging Productivity." New Haven : Yale University, 1976. (Photocopied)

Kordish, Heike. Cost Analysis of Original Cataloging : Paper presented at the American Library Association Annual Conference (95th, Chicago, Illinois, July 18-24, 1976) ERIC ED 127 994.

Krieger, Tillie. "Calling a Bull 'Cow' Won't Get You Milk, or Is Too Much of a Good Thing Good?" Journal of Academic Librarianship 40 (July 1978) : 130-1.

Library Education and Personnel Utilization : a Statement of Policy Adopted by the Council of the American Library Association, June 30, 1979. Chicago.

McLean, Dulce Didio. Statistical Measurement and Cataloging : Variables Determining Quantitative Output. 1975 ERIC ED 144 606.

Martell, Charles R. and Richard M. Dougherty. "The Role of Continuing Education and Training in Human Resources Development : an Administrator's Viewpoint." Journal of Academic Librarianship 4 (1978) : 151-55.

Payne, Eleanor. Cataloging Productivity Quotas : paper presented at the annual conference of the American Library Association Resources and Technical Services Division, Cataloging Norms Discussion Group (Chicago, Illinois, June 20, 1977) ERIC ED 150 965.

Performance Appraisal : Kit 53. by the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) Washington, D.C. : Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, 1979.

Professional Development : Kit 51. by the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) Washington, D.C. : Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, 1979.

Ricard, Richard J. "RTSD Cataloging Norms Discussion Group, [Conference, Midwinter, 1977]" Library of Congress Information Bulletin 36 (March 11, 1977) : 174-5.

Rothschild, N. P. "Arrearages : How One Library Eliminated the Problem." American Libraries 27 (1977) ; 235-37.

Ryans, C. C. "Study of Errors Found in Non-MARC Cataloging in an On-Line Assisted System." Journal of Library Automation : 11 (March 1978) : 125-32.

Snyder, C. A. and N. P. Sanders. "Continuing Education and Staff Development Needs Assessment, Comprehensive Program, Planning, and Evaluation." Jouranl of Academic Librarianship 4 (July 1978) 144-50.

Spyers-Duran, Peter. Goals and objectives of the University Library. Long Beach, Calif. : California State University, March 1977. ERIC ED 148 333.

U. S. Library of Congress, Descriptive Cataloging Division. "Descriptive Cataloging Manual, rev. April, 1979" Washington, D. C. (Photocopied)

U. S. Library of Congress, Subject Cataloging Division. "Promotion Plan Guidelines and Standards." Washington, D. C. April 1975. (Photocopied)

Veaner, Allen B. "Revision of Librarians' Cataloging." Palo Alto : Stanford University, 1977. (Photocopied)

Yarbrough, Larry N. "Performance Appraisal in Academic and Research Libraries." ARL Management Supplement. (May 1975) : 1-6.

Personal Interviews and Telephone Conversations

Caster, Lillie. Personal interview. 11 April 1979.

Chambers, Joan. Personal interview. 29 March 1979.

Dowell, Arlene. Personal interview. 29 May 1979

Dowell, David. Personal interview. 12 June 1979.

Dugas, Mildred. Telephone interview. August 1979.

Gosling William. Personal conversation. 13 June 1979.

Harris, Rodger. Personal interview. 5 April 1979.

Hill, Janet Swan. Telephone interview. August 1979.

Lester Daniel. Telephone interview. 7 June 1979.

Phinazee, Annette. Telephone interview. 19 June 1979.

Rowley, Jean. Telephone interview. August 1979.

Stone, Ann. Personal interview. 12 June 1979.

Thompson, James C. Personal interview. 27 April 1979.

Letters

Bradley, Doris Anne. Letter to Phyllis H. Carter. 9 August 1979.

Byrum, John D. Letter to chairperson, with enclosures. 14 May 1979.

--------. Letter to chairperson, 9 August 1979.

Caparros, Ilona. Letter to Lawrence O. Kline. 13 May 1979.

Caster, Lillie. Letter to Phyllis H. Carter. 15 June 1979.

Cozzi, S. V. Letter to Lawrence O. Kline. 8 May 1979.

Daniels, Mina H. Letter to chairperson. 27 August 1979.

Deshaies, Louis. Letter to Phyllis H. Carter. 13 August 1979.

Fitzgerald, Michael. Letter to chairperson. 18 July 1979.

--------. Letter to Patricia A. Polentz. 17 July 1979.

Greene, Richard. Letter to chairperson. 8 June 1979.

Hill, Janet Swan. Letter of attachment to questionnaire. n.d.

Hughes, Helen Margaret. Letter to chairperson, with enclosures. 6 June 1979.

--------. Letter to chairperson, with enclosures. 19 April 1979.

Lynch, Mary Jo. Letter to chairperson. 12 July 1979.

Nease, Pauline. Letter to John Byrum. 7 April 1979.

--------. Letter to John Byrum. 15 July 1979.

--------. Letter to Mina H. Daniels. 16 June 1979.

--------. Letter to Helen Margaret Hughes. 28 May 1979.

--------. Letter to Christina L. Landrum. 10 April 1979.

--------. Letter to Christina L. Landrum. 16 June 1979.

--------. Letter to Daniel W. Lester. 31 May 1979.

--------. Letter to Mary Jo Lynch. 16 June 1979.

--------. Letter to Mary K. Pietris. 31 May 1979.

--------. Letter to James C. Thompson. 7 April 1979.

O'Bryant, Mathilda. Letter to chairperson, with enclosures. 21 June 1979.

Pietris, Mary K. Letter to chairperson, with enclosures. 28 June 1979.

Polentz, Patricia. Letter to Jean Rowley. 8 June 1979.

Rowley, Jean. Letter to Janie C. Morris. 17 August 1979.

DUKE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

To: Original Catalog Librarians

From: Arnold Hirshon, Assistant Head

Subject: Committee to develop a Statement of Professional Responsibilities

Date: March 13, 1979

A committee has been appointed to develop a Statement of Professional Responsibilities for the Cataloging Department. The statement is to be primarily geared toward those doing original cataloging, but aspects are general enough to cover all professionals in the Department. The committee charge is to create a policy which covers the following:

1. The percentage of time which should be spent by a professional in direct "on-the-job" responsibilities versus special assignments and non-departmental activities (such as library committees). The committee should consider special assignments which may exceed the general percentages, and assignments both within and outside of the Department. In addition, the committee should recommend a general guideline as to what percentage of time the individual should contribute to professional development and non-department related activities. This statement would apply to all professionals in the department.

2. Set a general quantifiable level of expectation, with special considerations for type of material handled (e.g., literature versus copy which requires subject analysis), type of copy utilized (LC, member, or original), publication patters (sets, analytics, etc.), and other special categories. The figure derived should be established on the basis of a monthly average range for a full-time catalog librarian (therefore allowing for the figure to be adjusted for part-time catalog librarians), such as x-y titles per month.

3. There is always an expectation that whatever amount of work is produced, such work should be of a high quality. The committee should therefore design a scheme for evaluating the quality of professional cataloging, and set definable margins of error within specified categories.

4. The length of time someone should be routinely revised versus general consultation? When should revision take place? Consider the difference between a new catalog librarian versus a catalog librarian who is new to the library system. With whom, and under what conditions, should consultation generally take place for an experienced catalog librarian?

5. All guidelines which are designed by the committee must be compatible with all DUL policies, particularly those used in connection with CAP and term reappointments. The standards developed by the committee will be used as part of any administrative evaluation, as well as for administrative review for CAP and term appointments.

The committee is charged with producing its report by June 30, 1979. The committee is to provide positive and definite solutions to the problems presented. The committee is encouraged to consult with members of the staff of the Department, and to refer to statements or comments which have been made on these subjects in the relevant literature (e.g., ERIC reports, ALA policy statements, statements obtained from other libraries which speak in specific terms to the questions, etc.)

The report is to be made to the Head of the Department. Upon completion of the report, it will be issued to all members of the professional staff of the Department. Discussions will be held at that point to consider the committee recommendations, and to suggest possible changes before submitting the report to the Departmental Supervisors and Administrative Group (SAG) for final approval.

The members of the committee are: Pauline Nease (chairperson); Phyllis Carter; Avinash Maheshwary; Janie Morries.

QUESTIONNAIRE TO ARL LIBRARIES

April 20, 1979

List of Libraries Responding

University of California at Berkeley

University of California at Los Angeles

University of Chicago

Columbia University

Cornell University

Indiana University

Iowa University

Johns Hopkins University

University of Michigan

University of Minnesota

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Northwestern University

University of Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania State University

Princeton University

Rutgers University

Stanford University

Texas A and M University

University of Virginia

University of Washington at Seattle

University of Wisconsin at Madison

Yale University

Compiler's note

Predominant patterns for quantitative/qualitative standards in goal setting were not found, nor was there any consistency in preferences for length of training periods, revision practices, etc. The information in the analysis was not therefore used as a basis for the guidelines set forth in the text of this report.

(The information supplied by the questionnaire will be used for "in house" purposes and the report will be distributed to the responding libraries at their request. However, should the results of the study be such that the general library community would profit from a published paper, please indicate through your answer to IV D if we may cite your library by name.)

The term "professional cataloger" refers to a monographic cataloger with professional status.

Check more than one box in the questions if applicable.

I. Organization and Duties of Professional Catalogers

A. How many professional catalogers do you have?

☐ full-time _____

☐ half-time _____

☐ others _____

B.1 In your department, who is the immediate supervisor of your professional catalogers?

☐ Head of the Catalog Department

☐ Assistant Head of the Catalog Department

☐ Head of Original/Monographic Cataloging

☐ Other. Please specify. _____

B.2 Are your professional catalogers

☐ in one, centralized department?

☐ teamed up with bibliographers in smaller units?

☐ in branch libraries?

☐ in a combined arrangement of the above? Please specify. _____

☐ assigned in a manner different to any of the above? Please specify.

C. How do you decide what materials the individual professional cataloger catalogs?

☐ by subject

☐ by language

☐ by a combination of both subject and language

☐ by type of copy available (e.g. no copy, NUC copy, network copy, etc.)

☐ by format

☐ other. Please specify. _____

D.1 Are items searched by support staff for entry verification before being given to the professional catalogers for cataloging?

☐ in all cases ☐ in some cases ☐ not at all

a) Do they search for:

☐ main entries? ☐ added entries?

b) What sources do they search:

☐ national bibliographies? ☐ network data base?

☐ NUC? ☐ other? Please specify. _____

I. D.2 What responsibilities do professional catalogers have for searching?

a) Do they search for:

☐ main entries? ☐ added entries?

b) What sources do they search?

☐ national bibliographies ☐ network data base

☐ NUC ☐ other. Please specify.

E. What duties are professional catalogers (including subject and/or area specialists or bibliographers if any) expected to perform in the department in addition to cataloging on a routine basis?

☐ filing ☐ training others in the department

☐ revising filing ☐ collection development

☐ revising cataloging ☐ work with library patrons

☐ other duties. Please specify. _____

F. According to your most recent statistics, what percentage of the total monographic titles cataloged is done by professional catalogers

____ % centralized in one department?

____% in branch libraries?

____% teamed up with bibliographers?

____% in a combined arrangement of the above?

____% in an arrangement different to any of the above? Please specify.

_____

G. Of that total, what percentage of the total monographic titles cataloged is in the following categories? Please use your most recent statistics.

☐ L.C. copy ____% ☐ NUC copy ____%

☐ English language CIP copy ____% ☐ non-English CIP ____%

☐ network copy ____% ☐ no copy ____%

☐ other ____% Please specify. _____

II. Training and Evaluation of Monographic Professional Catalogers

What is the average training period for your professional catalogers:

A. directly out of library school with no previous work experience? ____ months

B. experienced catalogers, newly appointed? ____ months

C. librarians experienced in non-cataloging activities, newly appointed? ____ months

D. others. Please specify. _____

II. E. During the initial training period, do you revise everything the professional cataloger catalogs?

☐ yes ☐ no

F. Once you feel the professional cataloger has successfully completed the initial training period, what type of revision do you have?

☐ everything revised

☐ nothing revised

☐ spot revision

Please specify what type of errors you look for in spot revision.

☐ other. Please specify.

G. Once the cataloger is trained, do you quantify the amount of cataloging you expect the professional cataloger to catalog in a certain time period?

☐ yes ☐ no

If "yes", do you quantify the amount by:

☐ giving a range of numbers of titles in a certain time period? Please specify the range and time period. _____

☐ giving the professional cataloger a specific number of titles in a certain time period? Please specify the number and time period. _____

H. What factors do you take into consideration when determining either the range or specific number of titles?

I. If you do not quantify the amount of cataloging on an individual basis, do you set overall departmental quantitative goals? Please comment.

II. J. How do you determine the quality of cataloging performed by individual professional catalogers?

- ☐ keep statistics for the number of errors
- ☐ keep statistics for the type of errors
- ☐ combination of the above methods. Please comment.
- ☐ other. Please specify.

K. How do you assess quality cataloging if you do not keep statistics on an individual basis?

L. What specific qualitative goals do you set for professional catalogers?

III. Opportunities for Professional Development

A. What percentage of time do your professional librarians spend in direct "on-the-job" responsibilities versus special assignments and non-departmental activities (such as library committees)? Please comment.

B. How much time allowance do you provide for professional activities outside of regular duties, such as conventions, conferences, special projects, workshops, coursework, etc.?

IV. Conclusion

A. Do you have a written policy or standard for your professional catalogers to follow in terms of quality and/or quantity?

☐ yes ☐ no

If "yes", may we have a copy enclosed with your reply?

B. Do you have a written statement of policy for evaluating catalogers/librarians for continuing appointment, promotion, or tenure?

☐ yes ☐ no

If "yes", may we have a copy enclosed with your reply?

IV. C. If you answered YES to IV. A and B, please comment on how you use the two policies in evaluating your professional catalogers for promotion, tenure, or continuing appointment.

D. May we cite your library in any oral or written report to the general library community?

☐ yes ☐ no

Please check the space below if you would like to have a copy of this committee's final report.

_____ YES, I would like to have a copy of the Committee's Statement of Professional Responsibilities for my records.

Please return the questionnaire by May 25 to:

Ms. Pauline Nease
120 Perkins Library
Duke University
Durham,
North Carolina 27706

Signed by _____

Position _____

Institution _____

DUKE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

ARL QUESTIONNAIRE - April 20, 1979

SUMMARY -- ANALYSIS

I. Organization and Duties of Professional Catalogers.

A. Number of professional catalogers in each library:

Catalogers:	Less than 5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21 and above
Full-time	1	11	6	3	1
Half-time	14	--	--	--	--

Note: Those working more than half-time are counted as full-time catalogers.

B.1. Immediate supervisor of the professional catalogers:

	Head of Cataloging Department	Assistant Head	Head, Monographic Catalogers	Other
Number of Libraries	7	3	6	6

Notes: 1. In some libraries the Assistant Head and the Head of Monographic Catalogers is one and the same person.
2. "Other" includes catalogers reporting to more than one person or to a team leader who in turn reports to the Head of the Cataloging Department.
3. In one library the cataloger of the rare books and the area study catalogers report to their respective unit heads whereas the other catalogers report to the Head of Original Monographic Catalogers.

B.2. Location of Cataloging operation:

	Centralized in one department	Combined with branches or subject/area units	Other
Number of Libraries	18	4	--

Notes: 1. Essentially the libraries have reported only for their main technical services operation which is centralized in one department.
2. Four libraries reported some sort of combination. With the exception of two libraries, none has made reference to their branches. One reply for the combined arrangement was vague, e.g., area studies and rare books are cataloged in their respective units, but it is not specified as to whether or not these units are part of "Central Technical Services." In another library the Slavic cataloger is in Area Collections and her cataloging is revised in [the central Cataloging Department]. At Princeton, it is centralized but "does not include Far East languages."

C. Distribution of materials for cataloging:

	Subject	Language	Subject & Language	Type of copy	Format	Combination of preceding categories	Other
Number of Libraries	--	--	4	--	--	16	2

Notes: 1. In "combination" category the respondents checked subject, language and one

or more of the other categories.
2. "Other" includes the choice of material by individual catalogers.
3. At Northwestern the subject area specialists handle all the materials in their areas of expertise and the rest is shared by other catalogers.

D.1. Number of libraries with pre-cataloging assistance by support staff:

	In all cases	Some cases	None at all
Main entry	13	2	2
Added entry	8	4	--
Series added entry	--	1	--

Notes: 1. Three libraries gave no searching assistance. One of these said if they implemented team cataloging the support staff would take over the searching function.
2. In one library students search both main and added entries.
3. One or more of the following sources was consulted by support staff in pre-cataloging search: NUC, national bibliographies, network data bases, authority card file, union card catalog, etc.

D.2. Responsibility of the professional catalogers for searching:

In two libraries the catalogers are not responsible for any searching. At Princeton they "are expected to refer back to support staff when more extensive search [is] necessary." Other libraries indicate that professionals do additional searching as needed. Yale says the "ultimate responsibility for correct form of heading, etc." is the cataloger's. Wisconsin says "only problem entries discovered by the cataloger," would be searched by professionals, and the search would be in "specialized bibliographies." In general, however, the libraries indicated bibliographical sources as needed: national bibliographies, specialized bibliographies and reference tools, NUC, network data base, union card catalog and anything and everything considered appropriate.

E. Duties performed by the professional catalogers in addition to cataloging:

All the professional catalogers in the libraries surveyed perform two to four additional duties in the following categories: filing, revising (cataloging and/or filing), training others, collection development, work with library patrons, catalog editing, shelf-list editing, administrative responsibilities, committee work, special assignments, etc.

Notes: 1. Princeton requires all professional catalogers to do filing.
2. Six libraries indicated collection development and five, work with patrons (nature of work not specified) as additional duties of catalogers. It is unclear from the replies of the respondents as to whether collection development and work with patrons is the duty of the catalogers or of the area/subject/language specialists.
3. At the University of Pennsylvania "some have book selection responsibilities, others substitute regularly in reference and curculation departments."

F. Percentage of total monographic titles cataloged (according to the most recent statistics) by professional catalogers:

	9%	10%	15-16.4%	18-19%	20%	38%	42-49%	100%
Number of Libraries	2	3	3	3	4	1	2	*2

Notes: 1. The percentages indicated above represent cataloging done in centralized cataloging departments.
2. Two libraries had no statistics and are not represented. One of these estimated that their Original Cataloging Department did about 46 percent of the total monograph titles, but that the Department includes some support staff and also does some modified copy.
3. Northwestern reported 10 percent, but this figure excludes their music, maps, government documents and archives.
*4. The validity of this figure was not confirmed by the Committee. These libraries may have misunderstood the question.

G. Percentage of the total monographic titles cataloged by the type of copy:

	To 10%	11-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%
LC copy	7	1	1	4	3	-
Network/NUC	3	3	5	2	2	1
No copy	5	3	6	3	2	1
Other	1	4	4	-	-	-

Notes: 1. "Other" includes "No statistics available".
2. The figures in this table seem to be misleading. Definition of "original cataloging" varies among libraries.
3. "Other" also includes: "All shared copy and copy from other editions"--University of California at Berkeley. "Commercially prepared analytics"--University of California at Los Angeles. "Professional catalogers perform copy or partial copy cataloging only if the piece presents some special problem with description or headings"--Northwestern. "Professionals normally handle Library of Congress copy only to provide classification, e.g., for art and classics, which involve local systems"--Princeton. "Theses, added volumes and copies and microforms--none of which are considered by type of copy available"--Wisconsin.

II. Training and Evaluation of Monographic Professional Catalogers.

A-D. Average training period for professional catalog librarians:

For the catalog librarian directly out of library school, with no previous experience, there was some preference for either one year (six libraries) or six months (four libraries). Six institutions chose a three month period for the experienced catalog librarian, newly appointed. No other particular time period(s) were especially favored for any of the categories as the table below shows.

A. Directly out of library school with no previous experience		B. Experienced catalogers, newly appointed		C. Experienced in non-cataloging activities, newly appointed	
Time period	Libraries	Time period	Libraries	Time period	Libraries
1-2 years	2	1 year	1	1-2 years	1
1 year	6	6-10 months	1	1 year	2
9-12 months	2	6 months	2	9 months	1
8-12 months	1	4-6 months	1	8 months	1
8 months	1	3-6 months	2	6-9 months	2
6-7 months	1	3-5 months	1	6-8 months	1
6 months	4	3-4 months	1	6 months	3
3-6 months	1	3 months	6	3-5 months	1
3-5 months	1	2 months	1	3 months	3
Unknown	2	1-3 months	2	Unknown	1
Varies	1	Unknown	3	No answer	3
		Varies	1	No recent experience	2
				Depends on the individual	1

E. Revision during the initial training period:

All libraries revised completely during the training period.

F. Revision after the initial training period:

At four libraries, there is "no revising." However, one of these indicated "consultation on request." A form of complete revision is done at the University of Chicago, Iowa, and Yale. At the University of Chicago "all original cataloging is at least 'looked at' with the book in hand by the Head of the section. The thoroughness of the revision depends on the nature of the material and the cataloger. Special emphasis is on subjects, classification, choice and form of main entry, added entries, provision of references." At Iowa the professional cataloger revises while filing into the shelf list. Yale says everything is "completely revised or proofread."

Other libraries do some form of "spot" checking or "other" type of revision. Comments indicated many variations in the process, though in general the emphasis seemed to be on access points, tagging, authority work, etc. At one library mistakes are caught by the clerical staff or during the checking of OCLC cards. Northwestern depends somewhat on the awareness of known weaknesses of individual catalog librarians.

Princeton is in the process of developing "an equitable quality control system which will probably involve some type of spot revision." Minnesota noted "self-requested revision by new catalogers," and the University of California at Berkeley noted self-requested revision in general as part of a spot check system. The University of California at Los Angeles reviews worksheets for input; otherwise they answer questions for the catalog librarian as needed. The University of Pennsylvania notes their work is "generally" revised and the catalogers are encouraged to ask questions.

G. Quantifying the amount of cataloging a trained professional cataloger is to do in a certain period of time:

Only one library, the University of Washington at Seattle has a range--40 to 160 titles per month. The University of California at Berkeley says "notice is taken of individuals well below the average of the other catalogers." Northwestern does not keep individual statistics and there is "no count of items which may be available for an individual cataloger to tackle. (Material to be cataloged has exceeded available staff for the last several years)."

H. Factors taken into consideration when determining either the range or specific number of titles:

The University of Washington at Seattle states, "The extent of other duties and difficulty of material are the major considerations. The cataloger and the Head of the division discuss the question and agree on a reasonable figure based on the cataloger's other duties and on past experience."

I. Quantitative departmental goals:

Goals:	Informal (no figures specified)	Formal (approximate figures specified)
Number of libraries	17	5

Notes: 1. Out of a total of twenty-two libraries responding to Question II(I) only the following five libraries specifically mentioned the approximate number of titles they try to catalogue on a monthly basis.

"Use an informal figure of one title per cataloging hour as a standard. However, in a research library with a great variety of material, this figure cannot be rigorously applied. Because of the differences among assignments, comparisons of catalogers are impossible."--University of California at Los Angeles.

"Strive for 525 to 550 a month for the whole department."--Chicago. Chicago is opposed to any formally stated quotas.

"Aim to keep production within a certain range of titles cataloged per month (the range is a band 500 titles wide). If production falls below that band consistently over a period of months, various steps may be taken to increase the production." In the telephone interview, August, 1979, the Head of the Cataloging Department clarified the statement further. She indicated that 2,000-2,500 titles is the goal for both original and copy cataloging. The range as a band 500 titles wide represents the difference between 2,000 and 2,500 titles.--Northwestern.

"Each cataloger (original) discusses his/her individual goals with the Department Head and establishes an individual goal to spend half or more of the possible work hours on cataloging and produce at least one piece of cataloging per hour."--Wisconsin.

"One hundred titles per month each professional cataloger."--Yale.

2. The cataloging done by the professional catalogers in the above libraries is not entirely "no copy" cataloging. According to the answers to Question II(G) the total of professional cataloging in each library includes:

	No copy	Combination of other types of copy
University of California at Los Angeles	60%	40%
Chicago	65%	35%
Northwestern	90%	10% (includes original and copy cataloging)
Wisconsin	figures unclear	
Yale	31%	69%

3. Seventeen libraries having no specific departmental or individual goals adopt various methods of monitoring production levels to improve their performance. Most frequently cited monitoring methods are:

"... Time statistics are kept four months of the year, scattered through the year, and overall and individual averages are computed during those four months. This is done to allow catalogers to keep track of where they are among the group."—University of California at Berkeley.

"... a quarterly book count of the backlog is taken which gives an indication of the number of titles which are waiting to be cataloged for each team."—Cornell. (Individual averages are also computed and are available to catalogers to judge their relative standing among their peers).

"Our general goal is to catalogue as much as the library acquires so as not to develop arrearages."—Princeton.

Remaining libraries have expressed similar views.

J-K. Evaluation of quality by statistics:

How Kept:	By number of errors	By type of errors	By combination of type and number of errors	None
Number of Libraries	—	—	2	20

Note: Most libraries depended on feedback from the network error reports, public services, colleagues and the users of catalogues. The errors are monitored to the cataloger informally. In problem cases some libraries keep statistics on particular individuals involved, if and when necessary. Generally the corrections are carried out through informal contact with the cataloger "at fault."

L. Qualitative goals for professional catalogers:

Goals:	None	Question unanswered	Other
Number of Libraries	2	2	18

Note: The libraries in the "Other" category define the qualitative goal as correct application of cataloging rules and national standards, and fewer errors. Out of eighteen libraries in this category only Northwestern has given a detailed statement of their qualitative goals: "Eventual independence of review and instruction, except for certain prescribed areas requiring consultation—in-depth knowledge of the various cataloging tools, what they contain and how to implement them; similar knowledge of MARC format; detailed knowledge of departmental and library procedures and policies as they apply to the individual's assignment; ability to apply knowledge and rules to novel situations; continued growth, development, and awareness of cataloging and other library trends."

III. Opportunities for Professional Development.

A. Percentage of time spent in direct "on-the-job" responsibilities versus special assignments and non-departmental activities:

Notes:
1. Seven libraries have no statistics.
2. The University of California at Berkeley gives an approximate estimate of fifty percent for "pure cataloging."
3. Other libraries have given various ranges of percentages up to ninety-five percent as time spent in "on-the-job" duties. It is difficult to categorize accurately cataloging and non-cataloging time from the percentages quoted. Presumably, these libraries consider committee work and special assignments as "on-the-job" duties.
4. Percentages of time spent on various activities vary greatly from individual to individual even within the same library. "From ten percent to seventy-five percent of a cataloger's time amy be spent on non-cataloging activities." (University of Washington at Seattle)

B. Time allowance for professional activities outside of regular duties such as conventions, conferences, special projects, workshops, course work, etc.

All the libraries without exception are liberal in allowing time for professional activities. Most libraries never deny any legitimate request. Princeton allows up to one day per week as long as work is covered. Time allowed for classes vary: University of Pennsylvania, three hour per week; University of Washington, six hours per week; Wisconsin allows time only for the courses requested by the library.

IV. Conclusion:

A. Do you have a written policy or standard for professional catalogers to follow in terms of quality and/or quantity?

Four libraries have a written document; eighteen do not.

B. Do you have a written statement of policy for evaluating catalogers/librarians for continuing appointment, promotion, or tenure?

Seventeen libraries have such a written statement; five do not.

C. If you answered Yes to IV (A & B), please comment how you use the two policies in evaluating your professional catalogers for promotion, tenure, or continuing appointment.

Four libraries indicated they had both policies. Procedures of implementation vary. Three of these institutions supplied copies of their documents, which are available in the Committee's file of supplementary material.

D. May we cite your library in any oral or written report to the general library community?

	Yes	No	Conditional Yes/No
Number of Libraries	13	6	3

Committee to Develop a Statement of Professional Responsibilities
Questionnaire: For Original Catalog Librarians

Time distribution

1. Are you a full time or part time member of the Cataloging Dept.? (If part-time, specify the number of hours you work per week) _____

2. On the average, what percentage of your time is spent on the following duties:

a) Monographic cataloging: _____%

b) Duties other than monographic cataloging (Check the applicable boxes and give the total percentage for the whole group): _____%

- ☐ revising filing
- ☐ revising cataloging
- ☐ training others in the department
- ☐ collection development
- ☐ serials cataloging
- ☐ work with library patrons
- ☐ other duties. Please specify.

c) Special assignments, staff meetings, projects, committee work (Within or outside of the department, as a part of "on-the-job" work): ____%

d) Non-assigned activities (e.g. attending conferences, workshops, etc.): ____%

Workflow

3. How do you select materials for cataloging?

- ☐ by subject
- ☐ by language
- ☐ by a combination of both language and subject
- ☐ by format
- ☐ other. Please specify. _____

4. Are you satisfied or dissatisfied ... distribution system? Offer your comments, criticisms, ...

Training/revision

5. In your opinion, what length of ... factory:

a) for a cataloger directly out ... ol with no previous work experience? _____

b) for an experienced cataloger, ... d? _____ months

c) for a librarian experienced ... g activities, newly appointed? _____ months

d) others? Please specify.

6. As a measure of quality control, what ... vision do you feel is appropriate once the cataloger has ... completed the initial training period?

- ☐ everything revised
- ☐ nothing revised
- ☐ spot revision

Please comment on the reason(s) for ...

Quantity/quality considerations

7. Do you think the present amount of ... do is adequate?

- ☐ yes

8. If "no", please comment on any deta...

9. In your situation, can you set a qu... ge of titles you feel you can reasonably expect to catal...

- ☐ yes

a) If "yes", please specify th... _____

b) If "no", please comment as t... you cannot.

10. Are you satisfied with the quality ... ging you do?

- ☐ yes

If "no", what factors do you think ... u improve the quality of your cataloging?

4. Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the present distribution system? Offer your comments, criticisms, and suggestions.

Training/revision

5. In your opinion, what length of training is satisfactory:

a) for a cataloger directly out of library school with no previous work experience? _____ months

b) for an experienced cataloger, newly appointed? _____ months

c) for a librarian experienced in non-cataloging activities, newly appointed? _____ months

d) others? Please specify.

6. As a measure of quality control, what type of revision do you feel is appropriate once the cataloger has successfully completed the initial training period?

☐ everything revised

☐ nothing revised

☐ spot revision

Please comment on the reason(s) for your choice.

Quantity/quality considerations

7. Do you think the present amount of cataloging you do is adequate?

☐ yes ☐ no

8. If "no", please comment on any deterrents.

9. In your situation, can you set a quantitative range of titles you feel you can reasonably expect to catalog in a month?

☐ yes ☐ no

a) If "yes", please specify the range _____

b) If "no", please comment as to why you feel you cannot.

10. Are you satisfied with the quality of the cataloging you do?

☐ yes ☐ no

If "no", what factors do you think could help you improve the quality of your cataloging?

11. The committee has been charged with designing "a scheme for evaluating the quality of professional cataloging, and set definable margins of error within specified categories." Please comment on what factors you think should be taken into consideration in determining the quality of cataloging.

Organizational structure

12. What comments, criticisms, and suggestions concerning the organizational structure of the department can you offer which you feel might enhance the performance of catalog librarians? (e.g. reporting relationships, accessibility for consultation, etc.)

Professional development

13. Both the administration and the librarian recognize that in the interest of professional advancement the librarian will spend part of the time in activities outside the area of assigned job responsibility. What in your opinion is a reasonable amount of time that may be spent on such activities? (e.g. attending professional meetings, workshops, conferences, coursework, etc.)

Please feel free to attach any additional sheets for your comments.

Signed: _____

QUESTIONNAIRE

FOR ORIGINAL CATALOGERS, JUNE 11, 1979

COMPILATION AND ANALYSIS

Time distribution

1. Working hours:

All eleven librarians responding to the questionnaire are full-time members of the Department. Nine are full-time catalogers. One part-time librarian, scheduled to retire in September, 1979, does no cataloging and is not included in this survey. There is also a full-time vacancy (Music-German). The Ibero-American Librarian and the South Asian Librarian indicated they do part-time cataloging.

2.a) Monographic cataloging:

About fifty percent, on the average, of the work schedule is spent by the eleven librarians in monographic cataloging. The distribution of the cataloging time and the number of librarians for each percentage are as follows:

Percentage of time	Number of librarians	Percentage of time	Number of librarians
76	1	49.5	1
70	2	35 (one librarian qualified the answer as 30-35 percent)	2
69.5	1		
55	1		
53 (actually about 35 percent at the time the questionnaire was distributed)	1	25	1
		20	1 (varies)

2.b) Duties other than monographic cataloging: Activities indicated by the librarians and the number of individuals involved in each activity are as follows: routine revision of filing (7); revising cataloging (4); training others in the Department (5); collection development (3); cataloging serials (3); direct assistance to library patrons (4).

The percentages of time given by the librarians for non-cataloging work activities as a whole and the number of librarians for each percentage are as follows:

Percentage of time	Number of librarians	Percentage of time	Number of librarians
65	1	25	1
60	1	20	2
50	2	15	1
40	1	8	1
		7	1

2.c) Special assignments, staff meetings, projects, committee work (within or outside of the Department, as a part of "on-the-job" work:

Percentage of time	Number of librarians	Percentage of time	Number of librarians
45	1	10	1
25	1	5	3
20	1	1.5	1
15	1	.3	1

Note: One librarian indicated a possible range of 0 to 80 percent time spent in special assignments as the demand varied.

2.d) Non-assigned activities (e.g. attending conferences, workshops, etc.)

Percentages and numbers of librarians for each percentage are as follows:

Percentage of time	Number of librarians	Percentage of time	Number of librarians
10	1	5	4
5-10	1	2	1
7	1	0.2	1
6	1	0	1

The following is a composite list of activities given by the eleven librarians, divided as "assigned" and "non-assigned."

SAMPLING OF ACTIVITIES OF ORIGINAL CATALOG-LIBRARIANS

1. Assigned activities.

Revising filing
Revising cataloging
Training others in the Department
Cataloging serials (Hebrew, Orientalia, Slavic)
Assisting Acquisitions in establishing main entries for Hebrew materials
Work with library patrons
Translation
Marking Russian titles for the bindery
Making decisions for library designations for certain scientific materials
Searching Cyrillic alphabet books for LC/OCLC copy
Collection development
Cooperative acquisition program with area universities
Collection analysis
Administration of the South Asian PL480 Program
Processing South Asian material
Reference assistance
Correspondence
Supervision and training of student assistants
Liaison work with the Library of Congress
Processing non-Roman materials
Reading supervisory memos, minutes of administrative and supervisory groups
Reading professional journals directly related to cataloging
Participation in special projects as required
Serving on professional library committees, organizations
Serving on University bodies in an official capacity

2. Non-assigned activities — for promoting professional growth and advancement.

Professional library conferences, seminars, workshops
Learned society conferences, workshops, seminars
Classwork
Teaching
Editing
Research
Writing

Workflow

3. Selecting materials for cataloging:

Some catalogers had more than one approach. For instance, one indicated a choice by language "usually;" by subject, "but not very often;" and by format. A tally of approaches checked showed the choice was most often by language (6), next by a combination of language and subject (5), and less often by subject only (3) or format (1). One librarian is responsible for cataloging the Mazzoni collection and deals therefore with material in the Italian language over a wide span of subjects; hence the choice for this individual is predetermined.

4. Present distribution system:

Five librarians stated they were "dissatisfied" with the present system. One said "satisfied," assuming that the system involved getting one's own volumes from the labeled shelves, and that "it seems to be working." One librarian felt the system had not been fully explained and was not understood by all members of the Department. Another librarian had had no direct experience with the system, but felt that the catalog librarians might be penalizing themselves and the Library by "doing materials outside their expertise." One librarian thought the mechanics of workflow control, i.e., process of selection and signing out, causes a loss of professional time. The same librarian did not understand why the Pre-Cataloging Unit has the responsibility of the last OCLC search, while the error of duplication is attributed to the cataloger. Another librarian wanted to know what types of member copy paraprofessionals are now doing, and how much they will be doing in the future. This librarian indicated that all original catalogers should understand they are expected to do "all types of material." Four librarians preferred the assignment of material by language/subject areas. Another noted the Library was not making use of a specialized type of expertise (a reference to the earlier tabulation of subject and language areas compiled for all catalog librarians)

Training/revision

5. Opinions of the librarians about length of training periods:

The length of the time period(s) preferred and the number of catalogers for each option is shown in the table below:

5a. Directly out of library school with no previous experience		5b. Experienced catalogers, newly appointed		5c. Experienced in non-cataloging activities, newly appointed	
Time period	Catalogers	Time period	Catalogers	Time period	Catalogers
24-36 months	1	6-10 months	2	24 months	1
12-18 months	2	6-8 months	1	12-18 months	1
12 months	4	6 months	5	12 months	5
10-12 months	1	3-5 months	1	7-8 months	1
6-12 months	1	3-4 months	1	6-12 months	1
6 months	1	1 month plus two full months of revision	1	6 months	1
1 month plus two full months of revision	1			1 month plus two full months of revision.	1

Comments by individuals:

"It varies from person to person, trainer as well as trainee, but I think there is a problem if the length of training takes longer than six months."

"Category (c) depends on previous experience."

"Length of training will depend on aptitude of trainee and amount of time spent in actual cataloging. Part-time cataloger will require more time because training is less intensive."

Quantity/Quality considerations

6. Type of revision preferred by the catalog librarians:

All catalog librarians preferred some form of revision. There seemed to be the feeling that spot revision is better than no revision. There also seemed to be the acknowledgement that in the interest of economics and time, spot revision might be an acceptable compromise. Three expressed a preference for full revision, one found the "bounce back" system acceptable, and the others selected spot revision.

Comments by individuals:

"We have a reputation for quality cataloging; and as everyone, no matter how well trained, makes careless errors, more or less frequently, revision seems to be the only way to be sure of maintaining quality cataloging."

"Time spent versus quality desired. The compromise is spot revision. Spot revision should be thorough within the sample selected for revision, however, and the appearance of consistent errors should bring about one hundred percent revision until the errors disappear."

" I think it should be done frequently enough to 'know' the work of the cataloger. Actually I am comfortable with 'everything revised' but do not feel it is economically feasible. I do have reservations about the 'slipping of quality' without complete revision, especially in view of the fact that revisers have said it is possible to search out an error on most given records if one looks long enough--or if looking at several records done by the same catalog librarian in a day, generally, some error will surface. OCLC's Helen Hughes emphasizes the need for proofreading every record--this aside from revision."

"Actually I doubt that catalogers who are fully trained should undergo even spot revision. However, if we're to regard Solinet error reports, it seems it will be necessary to run a spot revision if there are bad, many, or persistent errors."

"Ideally I would prefer to have everything revised and insure top quality cataloging--would offset cataloger's occasional bad days or lapses of memory. Spot revision would be better than nothing."

"Nobody is perfect."

"1) It would give the catalog librarian a sense of professional responsibility if everything the librarian cataloged were not revised.
2) Even if all the catalog librarian's work is revised mistakes will still slip through.
3) With going on line, the establishment of the Post-Cataloging Operations Section, and the cataloging expertise located in that area, the need for everything to be revised before the material is sent through does not seem to be as needed."

7. Do you think the present amount of cataloging you do is adequate?

Five librarians replied "yes." Four said "no." Two said "yes and no." One who checked "yes" said "I have nothing to compare it with." One librarian who said "yes and no" stated: "Yes--on good days when little else interrupts" and "no--if cataloging is my job, I'm not getting to spend enough hours at it because of outside commitments."

8. If "no," please comment on any deterrents:

Comments by individuals:

One librarian listed "(1) Cataloging is done fastest when there are no other interruptions or commitments; (2) Often the cataloger with more experience that you want to consult for a problem is unavailable; (3) current non-revision or self-revision practices slow down out-put."

Another commented: "Some of it is just myself--wasted motions. Some of it is, or has been, uneven training. Unaccountable attutudes."

Another commented: "I am not located very far from where I was before the furniture was rearranged. I have adjusted somewhat to the higher degree of noise, traffic, more frequent interruption by people and phone, but I believe it has affected and still is affecting the quantity I can do."

"It would be easier to concentrate one's efforts on expanding knowledge of subject/language if allowed to go back to specialty areas of cataloging. One can't judge just now what courses would really help, what seminars would give the greatest feedback (there are many wonderful opportunities free on campus during the winter, e.g. departmental seminars. One has to choose and unless he follows his own interest lines could get a smattering of a lot, but not a great deal in depth to really reap the benefits of feedback into the work process."

One librarian enumerated the following points: "(a) I deal with half a dozen languages and have no assistance for any kind of pre-cataloging searching; (b) free-style, inconsistent and sometimes confusing Library of Congress cataloging; (c) don't have equal proficiency in all the languages I deal with; (d) physical separation from the rest of the cataloging operation in the library ..."

9. In your situation, can you set a quantitative range of titles you feel you can reasonably expect to catalog in a month?

Four librarians did not set a range. One of these said "three a day," which would be a quota, not a range. The ranges suggested were all different, but there was a tendency for more librarians to favor a lower range of twenty or twenty-five items and an upper range of from thirty to eighty.

Comments by individuals:

"I have not had a rational figure yet."

"It depends on the grade of difficulty of the material."

"Pre-OCLC we did lots of NUC copy, now some copy catalogers are doing most of the member copy."

"When cataloging Hebrew material, I spend much more time per item than I do with English ... "

"It depends on my involvement in committees ... and with the different tasks specified in question 2."

10. Are you satisfied with the quality of the cataloging you do?

Ten of the catalog librarians were satisfied with the quality of their work. However, two indicated "fairly so," and another said, "but I don't claim perfection." One affirmative answer was really "yes and no" for the following reason: "On the whole, 'yes', but I feel that I will continue to make improvements in the area of 'typos' [and will find myself] in less need for consultation as I continue to catalog."

One librarian who answered "yes" nevertheless added, "It is frustrating to work diligently on a piece of cataloging and still find one has slipped up on one of the copious 'details.' I do feel if one can work consistently in an 'area' such as science, music, art, or whatever, the similarity of the material helps these details to become more 'fixed' in mind."

Another librarian who replied "yes" qualified the answer with "as long as I can feel free to ask questions about what I am doing and can have my work revised when I feel unsure of it."

11. Factors to be considered in determining the quality of cataloging:

The librarians suggested the following areas of concern:

1. Conforming to, and knowledge of Library of Congress rules and standards.
2. Successful application of AACR.
3. Strict conformity to the Level I standards of input into OCLC.
4. Careful subject analysis.
5. Observance of Duke University Library practices.
6. Bibliographic completeness in terms of notes (but not to excess), i.e., degree of fullness.
7. Reasonable attention to detail and format.
8. Careful attention to required detail.
9. Accuracy in tagging--avoiding duplication.
10. Ability to organize work efficiently.
11. Initiative to make suggestions for the overall improvement of cataloging operation and operations that impinge upon it.
12. Professional attitude (intangible quality) that is reflected both in the person's own work as well as in the person's working ralationship with colleagues.
13. Understanding of LCSH and the use of other bibliographic sources.
14. Interpretation of the cataloging rules and classification tools.
15. Knowledge of when to consult and when to make solitary decisions about tricky or ambiguous cataloging problems.
16. Minimum of careless errors.

No order of priorities is suggested by the listing above. One librarian said "Do not have enough information on the definable 'margins of error' at this point." One other comment was given: "If there is no revision who will determine how well a cataloger is meeting any standard devised? Again, if the cataloger has a regular reviser she/he will be aware of the difficulty or simplicity of the cataloging done during the month by a cataloger--this knowledge can be balanced against monthly statistics."

Organizational structure

12. Comments, criticism and suggestions concerning the organizational structure which might contribute to enhancement of the work performance of catalog librarians:

Seven librarians felt the need to be able to readily consult with an authoritative source.

Comments by individuals:

"It would be nice ... if we reinstituted regular departmental meetings with prior section meetings [and] ... if we had the same training to edit and produce on-line member copy as have the copy catalogers."

"It would be a help if all members of the Supervisory and Administrative Group were to have a specified time each day assigned to be at their desk for the fundamental purpose of answering staff questions. I hope some consideraton is given the possibility of professionals getting in there and doing an 'I' job before so many do a 'K.' Work would be more inspiring."

" I feel very strongly that all questions on cataloging problems should be taken to the Principal Cataloger. This is the only way we can be sure everyone is doing things the same way ... Catalogers should also feel free to request that a book be revised by her if it is causing a lot of problems."

"If guidelines or recommendations the Committee makes about quality or quantity considerations and other matters are going to work at all, catalog librarians must have a coordinator or some person with enough time to be devoted specifically to catalog librarians, to coordinate policies for the unit, set unit goals, etc. Therefore, I would recommend that a full time coordinator for catalog librarians be employed. In addition to these duties, this person could coordinate the flow of materials into the unit." Other suggestions made by this librarian include (1) a representative of the original catalog librarians to serve on the Supervisory and Administrative Group, (2) clarification of the Pre-Cataloging Unit's policy of searching, (3) a better organization of the flow of material to the Original Cataloging Unit so that people are working in their subject and/or language fields of expertise, and (4) a decision (possibly a written policy) about how to handle audio-visual material.

Suggestion was made by another librarian "to locate professional catalog librarians in a location where we have the least noise, or traffic by one side only; to provide a system by which books will be brought to our desks as it was previously done; and to give catalog librarians the responsibilities of (a) revising the final input of the product of their cataloging and (b) doing the last search before cataloging the books."

Professional Development

13. Reasonable amount of time to be spent in professional activities, e.g., attending professional meetings, workshops, conferences, course work, etc.:

There may have been some overlap in the figures given here if catalog librarians interpreted this percentage to include official representation of the Library on professional bodies, or on committees, whether within, or outside of the Department. These are viewed by the Committee, according to Question 2 as "on-the-job" assignments and should not have been included here. Percentages which were suggested include:

Percentage of time	Number of librarians	Percentage of tiem	Number of librarians
40-60	1	10-20	1
33 1/3	2	10-15	1
Up to 25	1	5	1

Of the other librarians, one gave no reply; another indicated "no limit;" and a third said "whatever he feels like, outside of work hours." A fourth wanted a definitive statement on exactly how much time a librarian is expected to spend in this manner. Full comments of several librarians are given below:

"I feel that as much time as the individual librarian wishes should be granted for attending professional meetings, conferences, etc. For course work, the Library's policy of three hours per week per semester seems adequate unless the person is pursuing an advanced degree. To me, the question is more in the area of work on departmental and library committees that are not in one's job description per se. It seems that forty to sixty percent of one's time is not out-of-line with the present situation."

"A librarian's top most duty is to fulfill his/her obligations under the terms of his/her appointment. Once these obligations are satisfactorily met with, the librarian should be free to engage in activities outside of his/her routine duties. Every case must be decided on an individual basis. I believe that if a librarian's involvement in professional activities at a local, regional or national level are likely to result in a meaningful contribution to the profession or to the users, he/she should be allowed ten to twenty percent time (or more) depending upon the importance of the role of the librarian. It needs to be emphasized that according to the Committee on Appointment and Promotion and term reappointments, a librarian's involvement in outside professional activities is an essential part of his duties."

"I don't think this should be quantified. The librarian and supervisor should agree on fluctuations as opportunities, needs (for course work, etc.) become evident, and balance it with normal work assignments. I don't think it unreasonable to say that a librarian should be allowed a <u>minimum</u> of ten to twenty percent [of the work schedule], with an option for more as indicated. More is expected the higher one goes in rank."

"I find that even with the amount of 'going' I have done this year, it it is a small percentage of my time. So—I think there is no limit on meetings, as long as one can find the money. I think courses should probably have a top limit."

Committee to Develop a Statement of Professional Responsibilities

Questionnaire - For Professional Librarians in the Catalog Dept. Whose Primary Job Responsibility is Something Other than Original Monographic Cataloging

1. Both the administration and the librarian recognize that in the interest of professional advancement the librarian will spend part of the time in activities outside the area of assigned job responsibility. What in your opinion is a reasonable amount of time that may be spent on such activities? (e.g. attending professional meetings, workshops, conferences, coursework, etc.)

2. From your observations and experience, do you think the present distribution of material for original cataloging is satisfactory? If not, please offer your comments or criticisms for improvement.

3. From your experience, what length of training do you think is appropriate for an original catalog librarian:

a) directly out of library school with no previous work experience? _____months

b) experienced but newly appointed to the library system? _____ months

c) experienced in non-cataloging activities, newly appointed? _____ months

d) others. Please specify.

4. As a measure of quality control, what type of revision do you feel is appropriate once the catalog librarian has successfully completed the initial training period?

- ▱ everything revised
- ▱ nothing revised
- ▱ spot revision

Please comment on the reason(s) for your choice.

5. a) The committee has been charged with designing "a scheme for evaluating the quality of professional cataloging, and set definable margins of error within specified categories." Please comment on what factors you think should be taken into consideration in determining the quality of cataloging.

b) For determining the rate of error, would you keep statistics for each individual catalog librarian?

☐ yes ☐ no

If "yes":

☐ on a continuing basis?

☐ periodically (specify frequency)?

☐ other? Please specify.

6. What comments, criticisms, and suggestions concerning the organizational structure of the department can you offer which you feel might enhance the performance of catalog librarians? (e.g. reporting relationships, accessibility for consultation, etc.)

7. Do you think there are ways in which greater cooperation could be promoted between the professional catalog librarians and other sections of the Catalog Dept.? Please comment.

Please feel free to attach additional sheets for your comments.

Signed: _____

QUESTIONNAIRE

June, 1979

This survey includes supervisory, administrative, and editing librarians, and one catalog librarian who is not presently cataloging, but is assigned to other activities within the Department.

1. Reasonable amount of time which may be spent on activities which contribute primarily to the professional development of the individual librarian, e.g., attending professional meetings, workshops, conferences, course work, etc.:

Three librarians favored ten percent of the work schedule; one said twenty-five percent; and a fifth one said, "I don't think this can be quantified." This librarian felt that it depended "on what is happening in the life of the person and the requirements of the Library. It also depends on the person--"I would judge not on the basis of the amount of time but the appropriateness of the activity.

Another librarian noted that the percentage should take into account the workload of the Department. She feels this is "in accordance with the Committee on Appointment and Promotion papers which ... indicate that you will be promoted, based on job performance as a prime criterion." She pointed out that additional time might be needed for such activities depending upon the situation. In those cases, the Department Head should be notified ahead of time to assure effective departmental planning.

2. From your observations and experience, do you think the present distribution of material for original cataloging is satisfactory? If not, please offer your comments or criticisms for improvement.

One librarian stated "We need a system whereby people take materials in their fields of competency, at the same time providing a means of regularly distributing those titles which fall into no one's perview. This would require someone to look at the materail being left behind and assigning it to catalogers." Another noted that it seems "inefficient to have to go through many books to get to your particular language."

3. Length of training periods for original catalog librarians:

Suggested time periods and the number of librarians favoring each are shown in the following table:

Directly out of library school with no experience		Experienced catalogers, newly appointed		Experienced in non-cataloging activities, newly appointed	
Time period	Librarians	Time period	Librarians	Time period	Librarians
2 years	2	4 months	1	2 years	1
1 year	1	2-4 months	1	8-12 months	1
6-8 months	1	3-6 months	1	12 months	1
6 months	1	3 months	1	5-7 months	1
		little experience	1	6 months	1

Comments:

"I think 'successfully completed' is a misnomer. Training is a continuum. I would estimate three to five years to become a 'fully trained' cataloger."

"In any case, until trained is the answer. The length can vary so, depending on the person's talent for cataloging."

4. Revison:

One librarian said everything should be revised. The others indicated "spot revision."

Comments:

"I select this [i.e., spot revision] because I don't think we can afford either of the other two options. (We don't have the staff and time to revise everything. On the other hand if nothing is revised, quality control is lost and evaluation becomes next to impossible."

"I believe it takes two years for a cataloger to become proficient (and to get exposure to many different types of cataloging problems). During that time all work should be revised. Even when a cataloger becomes proficient, careless errors can occur, so at least some amount of spot revision is necessary to cut down on these, especially when cataloging is going into a national data base ... I think the catalogers could cross revise one another's work. If a cataloger consistently produces quality work with negligible errors, then only spot revision is necessary."

5. Factors which should be taken into account in determining the quality of cataloging:

1. Adherence to AACR in description.
2. Knowledge of previous codes.
3. Accuracy of form in main and added entries--Library of Congress form whether AACR or not.
4. Correct subject headings (form) appropriate to book.
5. Adherence to local policies and practices in description and subject cataloging.
6. Authority work.
7. OCLC coding.
8. A certain quality of "sophistication"--of notes, added entries, etc.

The above is a sampling of factors and no levels of priority are intended in the arrangement of the listing.

6. Comments, criticism, and suggestions concerning the organizational structure of the Department which might enhance the performance of catalog librarians:

Those who commented indicated the need for one individual to serve as a head of the Original Cataloging Unit.

7. Do you think there are ways in which greater cooperation could be promoted between the professional catalog librarians and other sections of the Catalog Department? Please comment.

Comments:

"Joint meetings held by the Department Head would be useful."

"I think it would be useful to have occasional meetings with the Library Assistant Catalogers."

"I am hoping that in time the Pre-Cataloging Unit can take on responsibilities of doing some pre-cataloging searching of entries to be used by the original catalogers. This would require that someone set up the potential entry, and would require a system whereby the pre-cataloger searched and/or verified the entry for the cataloger. Perhaps someone in the Original Section will need to be designated as a liaison person with the Pre-Cataloging Unit for this function."

One librarian suggested (1) representation on Supervisory and Administrative Group by the section head of the catalogers and (2) "orientation tours among the various sections to familiarize people with the duties of each job and with the locations of various tools and files, etc.,in each section."